THE CHURCHMAN.

VOL. XIII.—No. 24. THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF THE TRUTH.—1 TIM. III. 15. WHOLE NUMBER 648.

PUBLISHED FOR THE PROPRIETOR. NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 19, 1843. BY JAMES A. SPARKS, 109 NASSAU-ST. TERMS—$3 00 PER ANNUM—IN ADVANCE.

COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Churchman.

REVIEW.

PAST AND PRESENT. By THOMAS CARLYLE. Printed London. Reprinted Boston: Little & Brown. 1843.

In a certain small village,—which we would describe but for two reasons—the first of which, "that we have not been there," an undiscerning [illegible] may count the better reason; the second—but it is not worth while to tell the second, the first being amply sufficient,—there lived a certain old gentleman named "Smith," which name his honor the mayor of Philadelphia counts "no name at all," and therefore of late sent a man to prison for giving in his name "John Smith," which, as it turned out, being the real name. In the same place there was a large tenement, which having got the reputation of the "haunted house," had no inhabitant; the very children of the neighborhood would cross over to the other side, rather than tread upon the pathway that separated its antiquated front from the street. Mr. Smith, we had forgot to say, had studied theology in a peculiar style of his own, and got to be very profound in it, so profound, indeed, that the neighbors thought him gone a little beyond his depth, and "sorter crazy." These were the only notabilities in the village—the "crazy gentleman" and the "haunted house;" the rest of the people and tenements being quiet and common-place enough: houses to cook in, to sleep in, to live in, with no touch of sentiment, not an association of romance attached to them; people too occupied much in the same way, minding their duty and business in a very unexcited way; men of genius and such like cattle would call both houses and men stupid and uninteresting in the highest degree. We know better.

One night when the stupid people were asleep in their stupid houses, after midnight a din arose that started the whole village from its quiet repose—a din so horrible and strange, that at once it aroused them all. After the first uncertain moment of trepidation, the more courageous householders issued forth with lights; and following it up, in a little time, they met before the front of the "haunted house." This evidently was the locale of the noise. They dared not break into it to find the cause of the horrid din, which still continued. The more courageous hailed it with shout upon shout; they even rattled stones against its long-closed casements; while the more timid hurried home to tell their wives that "infernal spirits were holding a concert in the haunted house,"—for the performance was evidently instrumental; and they hurried back to catch a few bars of the music, certain that, since their husbands had got safe home, it could do them no harm. In short, the whole village was in a short time all assembled. Yet still they preferred waiting for daylight, and in the mean time listened to the music. Bells and drums and trumpets seem mingled together; and through all, the perpetual bray of a most horrid sub-buzz, unlike to any sound of earthly instrument. Time, however, will hurry on, however delectable the music may be that entrances us, and daybreak came—the concert still continuing. Then they broke in, the old door making but small resistance. The boldest rushed up stairs, or rather were crushed up. Small time it took to burst into the antiquated drawing room whence the sounds proceeded, and there—sat Mr. Smith, performing on four instruments at once. He had rigged up with a smith's bellows and a sounding-board, organ fashion, a frame, which he worked with his feet; the main pipes were oxhorns. On his right hand stood a big drum, which the aforesaid right hand was beating ceaselessly; in his left hand a bell; and to complete the symphony, in the front of the oxhorn organ was fixed an old trumpet, so that he could bend forward and blow

> ——"a blast so loud and dread,
> The very sound would wake the dead!"

And there he sat, a fourfold musicianer; he did not mind the crowd till they fairly pulled him off his seat—and then, he told them that he was possessed with seven devils; that he was exorcising them with music, as David cast out the evil spirit from Saul; that he had got four of them away already, and that in less than twenty-four hours he would have cast the other three, the biggest of all, but for their impertinent curiosity. And so he burst away from the crowd, leaving them their music for their pains.

What has this to do with Thomas Carlyle? He is a man in earnest: he has felt that he is soul-diseased; that society around him, the life of England, is diseased also; or, as he calls it himself, "devil-ridden;" he has retired into the old "haunted house" of German mysticism, to exorcise the demons; and every now and then we hear from him a blast of horrible and dissonant clangor. And to do him justice, in this book he has far outdone his former instrumentations. We honestly think, that in dissonant and barbarous jargoning of thought and language, no Dutch concert, French charivair, or American callithumpian, can outgo "Past and Present." We have no power of language to describe the amount in the book of these qualities: the reader we therefore refer for some faint comprehension thereof to our friend the sage exorcist, Mr. Smith.

Yet this obstreperousness, this clangor of cymbals, is not dodonacan—no Jupiter is born there amidst. He tells of disease; an over-true tale, we fear, he tells, of no remedy. It is wholly unpractical—a declaration of heart-sickness, which not a pauper in England, not a workman, not a nobleman, as many such there are with true noble thoughts, but feels more bitterly if Carlyle declares it. What avails it that he tell them, "Be ye earnest, be ye high-minded," if he do not tell them some source and origin *outside themselves*, of earnest and noble high-minded thought? This he does not tell, and therefore we say the book is a failure.

Thomas Carlyle's literary course is instructive. He began with the quackery of Goetheism; taking it for real because he had in himself a reality which was not in the German quack.* He then got into Jean-Paulisms and Novalis-Mysticisms, mere critical and sentimental glorifications of human nature—things *very nice* and *unreal;* but yet written by a man that "had an eye," as he phrases it himself, a keen discernment of nature.

In one of these his critical essays he fell in with the character of Cagliostro, the impostor; this seems to us the commencement of his life, for here he found that man may be altogether and entire cheat and quack; his idea was formed then, of the Perfect or Earnest man, in opposition to this idea of the Quack. He had then got into the regions of Reality, and Human Nature.

Then came the "French Revolution," his greatest work—a strange one, truly, as founded on as strange a theory. He viewed it through and through as the strife of the Quack and of the Earnest man; a noble poem, with strange condiments—the most out of the way allusions, the most barbarous jargon of thought and language, but with a sort of antique stoicity about its tone that was very grateful. A noble poem, but pronounced Ape-fashion with fantastic chatter and contorted grimacery. Or rather, to take a metaphor like his own, "National Ruin, a puppet-show exhibited by Mephistophiles apetransmuted." He had got, however, into the regions of Reality, and the intense feeling of the change which he displayed in that book was very taking indeed. His contempt for the Unreal, his freedom from the Egotism of late years, that miserable spirit that ever cried out of "I," were very captivating to an age that had sickened of intense Melodramatic Byronism; and yet is too much of a "Worthy" age to care much for a solute "Wordsworthian" simplicity. A "primrose by a river's brim," is a very pretty thing indeed, and capable of an infinite quantity of de-moralization; but "Man's Life," its sources and secret springs, its noblenesses and meannesses, and above all its "life in action," are much more taking. And of these elements Carlyle seemed to be a master-knower. And yet his Heroes in that book! who but a "Mephistophiles ape-transmuted," could make a hero out of the splendid scoundrel Mirabeau, or the burly brawny-boned terrorist Danton? To us indeed there was something demoniac in the grimaces and flourishes and mere jackanapes grins with which he indicated these scoundrels as His Heroes. Something fearful in the state of moral feeling of the man who could sneer so truly and so ferociously at the sneaking vices—and look upon murder, adultery, treachery, and blasphemy, as but small things compared with value as indications of the existence of the new-discovered panacea for the world's evil "Earnestness." Carlyle's "French Revolution," to speak in his own style, was the Gospel of "Earnestness"—a Gospel such as Huneymaun, the Indian divinity, might promulgate. Criticism, mystic philosophy, (alias humbug,) and quaint pathos, had been his loves successively; but now he had got out these Unrealities into the Real, and "Earnestness" become all in all.

Common-sense men might ask what this "Earnestness" was? wherein it differed from mere "Head-work?" But no—it must be "Earnestness" about the Supernatural—in short, common-sense men could get nothing out of Thomas. He spoke in a language with which they were unacquainted, a new Psalmanazaar, who invented a lingo for his own particular use. Yet common-sense men who had some notion of the Jargon the prophet spake in, and could appreciate the man, saw and rejoiced that he was getting into Realities; and believes that all this Gospel of Earnestness meant, and all it was coming to be, when fully developed, was the old truth that "man has duties towards God and his fellow man to perform, and must do them!"—and had hope of Thomas Carlyle. They considered that he, having at first start in good earnest turned his back upon "the truth that lay close at hand," was reaching after it; in the only way such persons can again attain to it, by travelling around the whole circuit of the earth's circumference, save one yard, to get at that which in the beginning lay within one yard.

"Chartism" was his next book. This we did not see, only some sorry reviews of it. "Hero Worship," next—a different sort of thing this from the grim gospel of "Earnestness," the adoration of Scoundrel Mirabeau and scoundrellisimus Danton. In this he proved historically that "man ever worships man, ever must do so!" That this is a tendency of universal human nature. And if it be so proven, as it seems very fairly done in the book, truly we had no need of Thomas Carlyle to know this. It was no new thing to US. We had no need of him to tell us that "such worship is the summary, ultimate essence, and supreme practical perfection of all manner of worship, and true worship, and noblenesses whatsoever." This we were taught on our mother's knee, when she spoke to us of the "Holy Child Jesus;" and when she went to heaven, our truer mother, the Church, took up the theme, and taught us more fully of the Incarnate Word, our Brother in the flesh, now seated upon the Eternal Throne and for ever to be worshipped. "Man," quoth Carlyle, "must ever worship man." True it is, friend Thomas—but if it be solely as a metaphor thou usest these words, then it is but the dumb instinctive voice of Human Nature, made after "His Image," that cries out in thee, "that all true worship is the worship of him the Incarnate Word." And if it be only metaphor, as we suppose it is, then Philosophers who can never look at matter of fact, except it be kaleidescoped, may be pleased with my Million-Hurd metaphoric talk; but rely upon it, we the Priest who, as a plain *matter of fact*, bear witness to the Incarnation of our Ever-blessed Lord, shall have of our labor a thousand fold more fruit of Noblenesses than thou. Nay, the poorest and most ignorant Christian Mother who takes her child upon her knee, and tells it how God was born of woman, how God Lived on earth, and Suffered and Died,—this woman is doing more for the world than Thomas Carlyle with all his genius.

After "Hero Worship," which comes so near the truth *in a metaphor*, for we do not, on the one hand, think him a Christian, for which we have sound reasons; and on the other, we cannot think that he means to set up a *real* worship of Heroes; and such Heroes too, Odin and Mirabeau, Sam Johnson and Oliver Cromwell, William the Conqueror and Danton—a stormy Olympus truly these Hero-gods would make of it. Then comes "Past and Present."

The book is properly a protest on the part of Labor unrequited, against a landed Aristocracy because dutyless. It is an assault upon the modern doctrines of Political Economy, Corn laws, Poor laws, and every thing else in the Government of England that seems to Carlyle unreal and unearnest. And its own unreality and impracticability is seen in this, that it ends off with a sorrowful looking backward after the "Feudal System," with a vague prospective dream of a "Feudalism of Labor," and a "Priesthood of men of Genius."

We have no love for English Aristocracy, for Corn laws, or Poor laws; and furthermore, as Americans, we have nothing to do with such things. Still less have we any care for Thomas Carlyle, as one of the "Immortals:" for we think that his works will remain intelligible but a short time, if he continue to write in the half-crazy style he has hitherto employed. In fifty years' time he must have become the obscurest of writers. It will take one dictionary of literary allusions; another of things of time, place, and circumstance, to which are made the most minute and evanescent references. Another still of Carlylisms; another finally of German Romance and Philosophy; four folio Lexicons it will take for the Literati of one hundred years hence to understand him. Besides this, even at the present day, to the mass of our American population who have not been trained up in that mixture of Heathen mythology and poetry and history, that makes Education in Europe, he is totally incomprehensible. They could as well read Sanscrit as "Past and Present." Besides this, personally we have a notion that real Genius has Calmness and Oneness of thought; and bow ourselves down to no Indian God, although many-headed and many-shaped, he have a storm of arms, and each one bear and brandish a weapon of war. Thomas Carlyle, in fact, is for England, for the Nineteenth Century in England—and not in America; a furious and fantastic negative is he, and contemptuous protest against her tradition since the Great Revolution in Government, Philosophy, Politics, and Religion. We therefore pass by altogether these matters: they are not necessary for us to consider as Americans, least of all as American Churchmen. Our sole object in this paper, is to show to the thoughtful Churchman, how near an earnest man, if he have reflectiveness, must come to Church Principles; how natural they are to the human mind, when it has a desire and thirst after true nobility of thought and action.

Yet, in a critical point of view, it is worth while to note his peculiarities, of which he has several of the strangest. One of the most productive in its results, and the one that, we think, gives the most gout to his writings, is an original defect. He seems incapable of Generalizing. And, on the contrary, individualizes every thing. When he admires, it is not the quality, moral or mental, that he admires; the general idea of it seems beyond him. He cannot apprehend it; he takes some one individual man in whom that quality shows the strongest; the man he takes as representative of the quality, and sees it in all his actions, worships it in him. And when he detests and scorns, as he does in a way that would have given a vast deal of comfort to Dr. Johnson,* then he shapes out for himself some individualization, at which "*more suo*," he spits with the grotesque ferocity of a thousand cats. Open his books,—any where,—and you find them full of these scornful individualizations—"Midas-eared Mammonism,"—"Partridge shooting Dilettantism,"—"Millocracy,"—"Sir Jabesh Windbag,"—"Mecenas Tweedledee,—all these, and hundreds more, mere individualizations for Thomas Carlyle to vent his fantastic spleen upon. In his French Revolution it was the same: every man, to his eye, was a representative; and the most of them detestable, hateable, despiseable,—a temple it is full of Pagods of the ugliest, and not for adoration.

Kindred to this, is his Mythology; for he has a mythology of his own, of a most peculiar kind. In the course of his reading, he falls in with a strange analogy, a grotesque notion, a queer story; this he works into one of his books, and ever after, were he to write a thousand volumes, it forms part of his mythology; the most ceaseless allusions are made to it, the most minute. "Cagliostro" comes in through all the "French Revolution." He took a notion of calling Robespierre "Sea green," or "cerulean;" through and through the epithet sticks to him, as relentlessly as Homer tacks "Eurukreion" to Agamemnon or "Gerenios Hippota" to Nestor. This book too, is full of allusions to all the odd stories that Carlyle has ever told, all the queer gimcracks that ever stuck in his pate. And to do him justice, he is the most retentive of men; if one such a thing get in, it never gets out. Here we have again all the old German Slang-Sublime of "Chaos and the Abyss," &c., all the old allusions reduplicated. New oddities too, new queernesses. He picks up an old Rabbinic tale of "Abes by the Dead Sea," these become to him a type of certain stages of Quackery; forty times through the volume he flings them with fierce spite in the face of the Pagods he detests. A story he has of Howes, Davies the pirate, and Choctaw Indians; buccaneers and Choctaws come up through the volume with an unceasing jackdaw chatter of a Frenchman who cried at the bar of Convention for an hour together, "Arrest the knaves and dastards!" and the story suiting Carlyle's whim, the words are repeated endlessly as if they had in them a healing holy force. Each chapter has a new one of these odd notions, as also allusions to all his antecedent whimsies, so that the last chapter of his last work must ever be an enigma, incomprehensible except to him who has read all that have gone before.

Yet we like the man, notwithstanding all his crotchets. And this we see plainly is running a great risk: for to apprehend his beauties needs a head almost as crotchetty as his own; a reputation we by no means covet, and are entirely without claim to. Besides, he has still hanging about him the tattered rags of that Unreal German Mysticism which was his first love, and which is our especial abhorrence. The confession, therefore, is no less generous than it is perilous. And the truth is, that such is his retentive nature, that whatsoever notion he has once held, he never altogether loses it; but the fragments of its phraseology hang about him still. And so is his style a mixture of all manner of Technicalities by which various quacks of late years have tried in their blasphemous jargon to regenerate the Age, and earn themselves a name. But Carlyle himself is no scarecrow, though all these rags are fluttering about him; not a mere bunch of rags, with no life in it, stuck up to frighten crows; but a Walking Scarecrow, a scarecrow with life in it, a tatterdemallion of furious energies; in truth, the very "Mad Tom" of Philosophers.

Yet we like him because he is in earnest, because he is in progress, and because we see he must ultimately come to the same conclusion at which we have arrived ourselves, that the "Church proper" is the "only source of true Nobility of thought and action, the only Reality in this world,"—and then, we hope for him, with the hope of a soul that estimates him, and loves him, and makes all due allowance for the circumstances in which he has been; that ultimately having come to this, he will bow down to Her teaching; and be enabled thereby to discern in the words of Christ, and his disciples above them all of John, the true spiritual realities he is in search of; for which he has been groping in vain, among the quaintnesses of German Mystics and all kinds of Heretical Eclecticism. This we believe he must naturally come to, if he be not led astray by self, as others in his case have been. It may be that, like many of the Germans of his School, he will turn Papist; abhorrent as this at present may seem to his old Scotch nurture; and it may be in God's Providence the best for him: but Church principles in some form he must ultimately embrace.* We would to God he were a Catholic Churchman, but we must be content.

W. A.

(*To be continued.*)

---

* We believe Goethe a quack; a great man, to be sure, but still a quack, who sold at Weimar for solid pudding, the half truths he had found, which might have led him, had he been in earnest, to the "Entire Truth." Quack in sentimental-suicidal Werterisms: quack in Scientific-adulterous "Elective Affinities:" quack in anti-Newtonic "Optics:" quack in New-Platonic-Symbolic "Wilhelmmeister:" quack in New-Faustus-Gospels of "Salvation by the Affections:" quack and dilettanti thorough and throughout. In short, as far as concerns him, we feel the entire truth of that saying of Burke, his friend, told in the "Characteristics of Goethe:" "Why the d—, Goethe, do you not act like a man—but stay here at Weimar, playing the lackey and lick-spittle, humbugging others and being humbugged yourself?"

* "I love a good hater," says Johnson, in Boswell's Life.

* The author, whose essays upon "the Church" were lately copied into the Churchman, was a Pantheist, as Carlyle,—as may be seen by a book of his published three or four years ago, called "Charles Elwood, or the Infidel Converted." Time passed by; he was in progress; and these papers were considered by the editor to be an exposition that himself would, but in a qualified sense, accept.

For the Churchman.

DRS. ANTHON AND SMITH'S STATEMENT.

Let us have "the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth."

Mr. Editor,—On page 14th of the "Statement of Facts," occurs the following:—"On the evening of this day the Trustees of the General Theological Seminary commenced their session. Into the particulars of the session it is not necessary here to enter, farther than they are connected with the subsequent course of myself and Dr. Anthon. A resolution was offered by Dr. Anthon, and seconded by myself, to this effect: that the attention of the examining Committee should be directed, as far as practicable, especially in regard to the Senior Class, to the points at issue between us and the Church of Rome. It was opposed, and by a vote laid upon the table. Another motion followed, that the attention of the same Committee should be directed to the examination of the students upon the distinctive principles of the Church; which was similarly disposed of."

Now, sir, I would ask the authors of the "Statement," if, in the above, they have stated the *whole truth;* or if they are not implicated in such a *suppressio veri*, as makes a false and unjust impression on the minds of their readers, against the Trustees of the Seminary? The truth is that, when the first resolution was offered, it was distinctly objected to it, that the Committee was not an Examining Committee, but a Committee on Examinations, whose creation and duties are provided for by statute, in which, the duty is definitely stated, that such Committee are to attend on examinations of all the students *by the Professors*."

This fact was urged again and again. It was stated, moreover, that in the early examinations of the students, so much confusion had been produced by examining Committees in proposing vague and irrelevant questions, that, at the instance of the late Bishop Hobart, the statute was so constructed as to confine the examination of the students in each department to the Professor; and limiting the duties of the Committee to an attendance on such examination, and a report of its results.

It was on account of this wise statutory obstacle, that the resolution was laid on the table. The second resolution of Dr. Anthon was, for the same reason, openly alleged, disposed of in the same manner. Immediately after which the Board gave ample proof of their desire to give Drs. Anthon and Smith every opportunity to detect the suspected heresy, if it existed. The usual Committee, consisting of nine members, but not including either Dr. Anthon or Dr. Smith, had been appointed before Dr. Anthon offered his resolutions. Immediately after the resolutions had been laid on the table, it was *unanimously* resolved to *add* three to the Committee, for the purpose of having Drs. Anthon and Smith put upon it. They were accordingly appointed; they accepted the appointment, and attended to the duty; and when the Committee divided itself into sections to attend the different classes, which were being examined at the same time, Drs. Anthon and Smith were requested to attend the examinations of the *suspected Senior* Class. In the course of the debate on Dr. Anthon's resolutions, it was suggested that a request, properly made to either of the Professors, to examine individual students on certain specified points, would undoubtedly accomplish their object. The examination of the *Senior* Class was so conducted. At the request of the writer of this, his catalogue was marked by one of the doctors, to designate the suspected heretics; and when *they*, who were thus marked, were examined by the Professor of Systematic Divinity, *they underwent a searching examination on those very Articles which set forth the points on which our Church differs from the Church of Rome;* and Drs. Anthon and Smith attended, each pencil in hand, to record their answers, and fasten any discovered error upon them. Yet, so triumphant was the result in acquitting them of the *vague suspicion*, that the only objection Drs. Anthon and Smith could make from the recorded answers even of him, whom they deemed the arch heretic, was, that in a few instances he modestly answered a question by saying, "It is said so and so by such a writer;"—or such was the opinion of Bishop B., and Dr. C.

Now, I would ask Drs. Anthon and Smith, was it fair, was it honest, to state only so much concerning the action of the Trustees in this matter as would necessarily leave the *false* impression on the public mind, that they had acted with a stern determination to prevent Drs. Anthon and Smith from,—in any way,—officially testing the correctness of their suspicions?

Let the public then, to whom the appeal of Drs. Anthon and Smith has been made, know *the truth* of this matter, and they may learn how to estimate "the statement" as a whole. Let them be informed, that the resolutions of Dr. Anthon were laid on the table, not to evade inquiry, but because they conflicted with the provisions of a statute:—that immediately after Drs. Anthon and Smith were unanimously *added* to the Committee on Examinations, and acted as members, and had the *Senior* Class assigned as their peculiar department;—that the examination of all whom they suspected of heresy was conducted, in their presence, in a most searching manner, on those very points in the Thirty-nine Articles on which our Church differs from the Church of Rome:—that their only objection made against any of the suspected, was that one of them, in some few instances, answered in the language of others:—and finally, that Drs. Anthon and Smith have omitted to state these facts, and have thus misled the public into the belief that the Trustees of the General Seminary acted with a determination to suppress all inquiry into the doctrinal soundness of the students of the institution,—which impression is shown by the above stated facts to be *unqualifiedly false.*

A TRUSTEE.

MR. CAREY'S EXAMINATION.

We have been permitted to make the following extract from a private letter of Rev. Dr. M'Vickar, touching his course in Mr. Carey's examination.

"You ask me what were the questions put by me to Mr. Carey in his examination. I reply, that they were few and simple; the result, however, of much previous reflection on the subject, and intended by me as 'test questions' to satisfy my own mind at least, how far the candidate's answers, supposing them to involve extreme opinions, should or should not militate against his ordination. The feelings which dictated them were as follows: In being called upon as one of the bishop's advisory council, I felt that I had a double duty to perform; not only to guard the safety of the Church against heretical teaching, but to guard also the rights of the candidate against being tried by other tests than those the Church imposes: viz; soundness in the one Catholic faith, attachment to the Church and her services, and *conformity* to her Articles. As the course of the examination called up strongly the latter sense of duty, I will trouble you with my views touching it.

I looked then at the question of Mr. Carey's ordination as the question of finding a flaw in a 'prima facie' good title. The burthen of proof* rested on his accusers; he had made good his claim 'canonically;' had passed all his examinations; had stood all the tests the wisdom of the Church had provided; on his accusers, therefore, (who by some strange anomaly sat there as his judges,) rested the *onus* of proof. In the eye of the Church, he was above suspicion. Now this their true position before their bishop and the Church, Messrs. Smith and Anthon did not seem to understand: they took guilt as it were for granted, and mourned over it, and held Mr. Carey bound to purge himself from it. On the contrary, then and there *they* were bound to bring the charge home, by showing, to the bishop's satisfaction, Mr. C's opinions in *what* was of Rome and not of the Church. Now this not only they did not do, or even pretend to do, but even by their own showing, when respectfully led to open that proof by the questions addressed to Dr. Anthon, first by the bishop, and again by Dr. Seabury, their replies evinced a settled resolution against going at all into it. This it was, together with the nature of their questions—hypothetical, vague, and entrapping—confounding matters of faith with all doctrinal questions, which was the cause of the frequent interruptions on my part, and that of others, of which they make complaint. It could not have been otherwise. Against their private notes, too, I more than once earnestly protested, as being necessarily false to the candidate, injurious to the other members of the Committee, dangerous in its results to the Church, and utterly inconsistent with the very nature of such advisory 'council.' Its advice once given, all is merged, even the very memory of it, in the full responsibility resting upon the bishop. But to return to what I was speaking of—the rights of the candidate: These I hold, on the broad ground of Scripture, to be 'vested rights'—deep and solemn, and not lightly to be disregarded, either by Churches, bishops, or committees. Under the Christian dispensation, in the Church Catholic, the door of admission to the ministry of reconciliation, however guarded, is yet an *open* door—open to all Christians who truly and duly seek it. It is of the Christian's heritage, (unlike the Jewish,) that all may seek it. It is his dearest privilege, that he may preach Christ crucified; and he who, 'inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost,' humbly and duly seeks entrance by that door which Christ hath opened, the Church, wo betide the man who shuts that door against him for any cause short of heresy, immorality, or open unfitness. Rejection from Christ's service, of any truly spiritual mind, however needful, is yet a fearful power. On the individual rejected, it falls as a thunderbolt; and if exerted on insufficient grounds, it becomes to him the highest outrage and injury, robbing him of his dearest birthright and privilege, and it may be, casting him out a prey to the tempter, and an outcast from the fold. To the Church, again, the injury may be incalculable, even the loss of a chosen servant, one fitted 'to turn many unto righteousness.'

Now Mr. Carey's was, to my mind, such a case. He was bringing to his chosen task a self-devotion and zeal beyond the ordinary, together with qualifications for usefulness, intellectual as well as spiritual, possessed certainly but by very few. The pureness of his moral character was above suspicion. The soundness of his faith on all great doctrines had been already thoroughly and satisfactorily tested; he had passed honorably all his canonical examinations; and now, at the very threshold of the temple, at the close of a course which he had run, full of honor and high promise—was the question mooted of his utter rejection, and the door to be closed against him, and all this on the dubious ground of his holding certain extreme opinions in theology—which, whether right or wrong in the judgment of individuals, are yet open questions in the Church, and have been held and taught in it by thousands in every age, without either rending its unity or subverting its faith.

The question with me then was, are these opinions, even supposing them to be extreme or false, such as would justify me (had I the power) forthwith to stamp them as heretical, and to inflict spiritual punishment on those who held them? If so, then, may I now conscientiously punish Mr. Carey for holding them, by withholding from him his otherwise well earned reward; or rather, so to speak, his 'common law right,' as a pure-minded Christian, of entering as a laborer into the vineyard of his Lord?

Now in this light I could not view these his opinions, though not concurring always in the language used by him; they fell, therefore, in my judgment, necessarily within the wide range of opinion allowed by our Church to individual judgment and conscience on all matters, whether critical or doctrinal, that touch not the 'faith once delivered to the saints.' Thus then I viewed them, and such I think has ever been the spirit and teaching of our Church. As a pure branch of the Church Catholic, she rests necessarily on a broad platform; other Christians may stand on it as well as we, though it may be on opposite sides of many a line. True Churchmanship thus becomes a question of the foundation, and not, as some would make it, of the thousand petty questions built upon it.

Under these views I attended Mr. Carey's examination, resolved to look at it, not in the light of an inquisitorial procedure against him, directed to draw forth, as from an unwilling witness, matter for his condemnation, nor even as the purgation of one accused and bound to defend himself; but rather in that broad and liberal light of Christian doctrine, which has always honorably distinguished our Church and its discipline from sectarian terms of communion—minute, verbal, and ensnaring. I resolved, therefore, to put no subtle questions to the candidate, to puzzle him with no hypothetical cases of conscience or with terms of double meaning, and to judge of his orthodoxy not by my own private judgment or those of any party or name in the Church, but those of the Church itself, as seen in the general current of its acknowledged Catholic teaching. And lastly, I resolved to look favorably and hopefully on the answers of one so young and so sensitive—so worthy, and so tried, and who obviously brought to the whole subject a heart devoted to the cause of Christ, and a mind more than ordinarily humble, candid, teachable, and spiritual.

When called on, therefore, by the bishop, I merely said, 'Mr. Carey, I have listened attentively to your answers, and while generally much pleased and satisfied, still find some of your professed opinions incautiously, perhaps dangerously worded; my judgment of them, however, will be determined by your specific answers to the three following plain questions which I will now put to you. I ask you, therefore,

1. The answers you have now given, do you hold them as of faith, and such as, if admitted to orders, you will feel yourself *bound* to teach and urge upon others; or as matters of mere theological opinion, open and discretionary to every individual Christian?

To this, his answer was distinctly, in substance at least, 'I do not hold these matters as of faith, but as questions of open theological opinion; believing such freedom to belong to individual discretion in matters not ruled by the Church; and therefore, though I shall never hesitate to express my opinion on any subject on proper occasions, yet are these not such matters as I shall deem it my duty to teach and urge upon the flock that may be committed to me.'

I then said, your answer is satisfactory. I ask you a second.

2. Is there any thing in the opinions you have now expressed or hold, touching the Church of Rome, or others, that interferes in the slightest degree with your cordial assent to, and conscientious profession of the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and of conformity to her Articles?

To this, his answer was strictly as follows: 'Not in the least; there is nothing. If there were, I could not make application as I now do with a good conscience for admission to orders in it.'

I then said, I will trouble you but with one further question.

3. If received to orders in the Church, is there any thing in your opinions expressed or unexpressed to diminish in aught your canonical submission to your bishop, and the other constituted authorities of the Church?

His answer was, 'There is nothing in the least.'

My conclusion then, was, 'I am content; I see no cause for Mr. Carey's rejection.'

Yours truly,
J. M'VICKAR.

---

* This refers not merely to the paper circulated by Dr. Smith, but also and still more to the pledge publicly given by both gentlemen before the Board of Trustees of the Seminary, to *prove* Romanism upon certain students of the Seminary, of whom Mr. Carey was well understood to be the prominent one.

To the Editor of the Churchman.

Rev. and Dear Sir,—Your leading editorials of the last three weeks relative to the occurrences at the late ordination in St. Stephen's, and to the pamphlet styled, "The True Issue for the True Churchman," I have read with particular attention, and I now deem it due to you and to myself to bear witness publicly to the entire accuracy, (so far as I believe and can remember,) of your account of what took place at the special examination of Mr. Carey; and to *offer* you my hearty thanks for your noble vindication of the truth. Among your fellow sufferers on this occasion, you have been a chief sufferer. In relation to the various charges preferred, such as that of your having interrupted the course of the examination by raising unseasonable and improper objections—of your having acted as the counsellor and advocate of Mr. Carey, combining the offices of the shrewd lawyer and the subtile polemic, you have surely said enough to satisfy any candid mind. There is, however, one representation in the pamphlet passed over by you in silence, that in my opinion is not less unjust and injurious than the charges to which you have alluded; and as I think it ought to be noticed, you will, I trust, pardon me for referring to it here.

On page 25 of the "True Issue," the several members of the Committee are spoken of as expressing, at the call of the bishop, their opinions as to the manner in which the candidate had sustained his examination. The decidedly unfavorable opinions of Drs. Anthon and Smith are given, and this sentence immediately follows: "Dr. Seabury said he should esteem it a privilege to present the candidate, as he had sustained his ordeal most nobly." Now this sentence, thus isolated, and in this position, certainly appears partly in the aspect of an arrogant and taunting reply to Drs. Anthon and Smith, and partly as indicating a sympathy so deep with the alleged Romish tendencies of the candidate, that the heart, "growing by what it fed on," could no longer restrain its joyous exultation, and its proud defiance.

How opposite is the impression made by speaking the whole truth! I remember distinctly, that when called upon by the bishop you said, that *though you differed from Mr. Carey in respect to several of his opinions*, your judgment upon the whole was favorable, and after a considerable lapse of time, (several other of the members having meanwhile presented their views,) apprehending, (as it seemed to me,) that the difference of opinion which you had expressed might be deemed of more serious import than it really was, you added that you should esteem it a privilege to present the candidate, for he had in your judgment sustained his ordeal most nobly. This correction I have made under the impression that justice to you demands it, and that there is greater propriety in its being made by another than by yourself.

May I now be allowed to say a few words on the main subject?

In the Churchman of July 22, you have unquestionably presented the true issue in this unprecedented case; and so will it be regarded (when the present agitation shall have sufficiently subsided to allow the voice of truth to be heard) by every man of intelligence enough to understand the subject. Is one man, or are two men, at any time, as private judgment or fancy may dictate, to be suffered to disregard their own laws—to turn away from their own tribunals—and to present their cause for judgment to the *multitude*, in an appeal against the entire authority of the Church which they profess and have sworn to reverence and to cherish? This is the true issue. Let me not be misunderstood. We hold ourselves amenable to public opinion. Churchmen have nothing to conceal. But as Churchmen—in our official capacity—for our professional acts—for our soundness in the faith—for our canonical offences—one of us cannot hold another responsible before the public, except through the medium of the constituted authorities of our Church. If a candidate for holy orders be deemed by any man unsound in the faith, or otherwise unfit for the office to which he aspires, let the objector make the matter known to the Ordinary. If notwithstanding this information, the accused person be ordained, and the objector shall still attach so much importance to his objection, and be so confident in his own individual judgment, as to believe the rector and vestry who signed the canonical testimonials of the candidate *to be wrong!* the Standing Committee of the diocese, who with a full knowledge of his case recommended him to the bishop, *wrong*—the regular examining presbyters, *wrong!*—the Special Committee appointed to examine him on the very grounds of the objection in the presence of the objector, and who "found him clear" on every charge, *wrong*—and the bishop who ordained him, ALL WRONG, *all mistaken, or all faithless to their awful trust*,—even then the wisdom of the Church has opened full before him a pathway to legal redress. Let him go with his facts and his witnesses to our highest ecclesiastical tribunals, and there open his grief. Let him there meet the offending bishop, and presbyters, and laymen, face to face, and he shall be heard to the very last syllable of his accusation. If in the court of last resort his accusation be not sustained, and he shall still think himself right, and the whole Church wrong, then he must pursue the course dictated by his *modesty*, his *humility*, his *love of peace*, and his *reverence for the spiritual government under which God has placed him*. He must, if he will, add another illustration to what Bishop Hobart once so eloquently said, when contrasting the corruptions of Rome with certain Protestant errors: "Mark the imperfection of the human mind: the throne of infallibility from which one oracle was displaced has been usurped by another; and *private judgment*, renouncing all that the wisdom of ages has sanctioned, all regard to the voice of the Church *Catholic*, not in the restricted sense in which the Church of Rome claims that title, but in its extension, *semper, ubique, apud omnes*, claims for itself almost all the prerogatives of *papal infallibility*."

But in a case in which this last tribunal has not been appealed to—in a case which would not bear its searching light—in which *Rumor* stands sponsor for the ominous charge preferred, in which a speculative opinion—an adventurous thought—or a wish warm with charity towards a large community of our fellow men, is entertained in the hour of the heart's deepest devotion, or of the mind's free range among the truths of God, and is communicated to the ear of supposed friendship, and is thereafter heedlessly or treacherously carried from one to another, increasing its magnitude at every transfer, until at length it assumes the importance of a vital error in doctrine—nay, almost of an apostacy from the faith—*in such a case, if a peculiar state of public feeling on certain religious tenets be taken advantage of*, and the adventurous opinion, thought, wish, or prayer thus magnified into matter of solemn accusation, be suddenly seized upon and carried over the heads of bishop and priest, and all the prostrate authorities of the Church, and thrust into the midst of the promiscuous multitude, men of all sects and degrees, so that it may strongly appeal to their prejudices and passions—if this be done, and if it be tolerated and allowed to remain as a precedent, why then, instead of the law of the Church, and of the land, we have Lynch law to *protect* our temples and our homes. Nay, we have the worst spirit of the worst ages of Papal oppression to deal with. Another Rome, different in outward form, but the same in heart, has risen in our midst with its inquisition, its scourges, and its fires. Fetters are upon the free thought. A spy is lurking at each avenue of the unguarded heart. In the companions of our social hours, and even of our devotions, we may meet with the familiars of the "holy office;" the populace is the grand inquisitor; and the vengeful shout of the swell mob responds to the thunders of the Vatican.

I have dwelt thus at length upon a single point, because, as exhibiting the true issue in this case, it ought to be prominent whenever the subject is brought into view—and because it exhibits the principle upon which I acted, when, together with five of my brethren of the Committee, I publicly declined "offering any defence" (as a member of the Committee) "of an act of purely canonical discretion." I held, and I hold myself ready to meet a responsible accuser before the proper tribunal, but I am not bound to answer any man who may choose to summon me to the market place, or other thoroughfare, there to be tried *by the chance passers by*, on a charge of unsoundness in the faith, or of apostacy from my Church. It was indeed a hard thing to be silent. My professional reputation, and even my personal honor, were at stake.

"Turni de vita et sanguine certant."

Of infinitely higher consideration, however, was the fact that five other presbyters, and even the bishop, were placed in the same peril. Our bishop, for years the tried friend and confidential counsellor of Hobart, and six of his presbyters, nearly all of them Hobart's friends, or pupils, or spiritual sons,—men of long standing in the ministry, (for even *of us, the juniors*, who are so contemptuously spoken of in the pamphlet, every one has been more than ten years in holy orders,) were charged, as I understand the matter, and as the world understands it, with ordaining or advising the ordination—*of a Romanist?* No! the ordination of a man who could reconcile *sacrilege* to his conscience!—who could approach the bishop for ordination, professing faith in a system which pronounces an eternal curse upon that ordination!—a man who came "*with a double creed in his hand,—the creed of Pius IV. and the Thirty-nine Articles—the Prayer-book and the Missal.*" The monstrous charge was printed. I heard the cry of the newsboys hawking it along the streets together with the worst effusions of the daily press. It went swiftly by steam, and on the wings of the four winds to the utmost limits of the land. It has entered the dwellings of distant friends and relatives, and filled their hearts with strange anxiety and sorrow. The enemies of the Church, far and near, have caught up the story of the unfaithful bishop, and the perfidious priests—and it is told with ungodly mirth in the haunts of the profane, that "the beauty of Israel is slain upon our high places, and the shield of the mighty vilely cast away."

Nevertheless I should have remained silent, until called upon by the Church to answer, had not three of my brethren of the Committee, *not as the bishop's counsellors, but in other relations*, deemed it best to repel the grievous accusation, and to state the truth. Knowing well that my continued silence would be misconstrued, I here offer myself as a witness in the case, not officially as a member of the Committee, nor even as a presbyter of the Church, but simply as an individual who has knowledge of the facts, and in justice to others, feels bound to testify. I need not follow the details of the case; you and Mr. Haight have relieved me from that labor by your accurate statements. I have however to say, that whereas in a certain pamphlet entitled "The True Issue for the True Churchman," I understand six presbyters of the Church to be charged with having advised the bishop to ordain a man who came seeking the diaconate with "a double creed in his hand—the Creed of Pius IV. and the Thirty-nine Articles—the Prayer-book and the Missal;" and whereas I understand this charge to be based upon sentiments expressed by the candidate in a conversation with the Rev. Dr. Smith, reported on pp. 8, 9, 10—29, 30, 31, of the aforesaid pamphlet;—and upon his answers in the special examination, held on the 30th of June last, at which examination *the materiel of the reported conversation was made the subject of questions put to the candidate, so that the examination covered the entire conversation*; and whereas I attended the said examination on the 30th of June, and heard every question proposed to the candidate, and every answer thereto—I now solemnly, to the best of my knowledge and belief, declare the charge to be entirely untrue. I speak not of the reverend authors of the pamphlet, nor of their motives, but of the charge itself; and that, let men qualify and explain, and color it as they will, IS UNTRUE. Mr. Carey did not come to us with a double creed—with the creed of Pope Pius, nor with the Roman Missal. He came to us, and went from us to the bishop, with the Creed of the Church Catholic in his hand—*with no Romish additions thereto*. He professed no other creed—he came to us with our Prayer-book in his hand—he came to us and said concerning the Thirty-nine Articles, that though, according to Bishop White's opinion, an *ex animo* assent to them may not be obligatory in the American Church, *he for his part did subscribe them ex animo*—(see pp. 9, 10, 21, of the "True Issue," where a contrary impression is distinctly conveyed)—his faith was not corrupted by a single article peculiar to the Romish Church. In charity to the members of that large communion, he thought it possible that they might honestly explain some of their distinctive doctrines consistently with the true faith, so as to relieve themselves from the fatal charge of apostacy, and bring their souls within the fold of salvation; while at the same time he deplored the corruptions of their Church, he repudiated her errors, and turned his face steadfastly away from her altars.

Can this be so? Did not Mr. Carey, in answer to the very first question in his conversation with Dr. Smith, and in his examination, appear to regard with complacency the alternative of seeking holy orders in the Church of Rome in case they should be denied him in our Church? And did he not in answer to another question say in effect, that in his opinion there is no real difference between the creeds of the respective Churches? NO!

The first question suggested the possibility of his being turned out of the Church of his fathers—of his being denied admission to the holy ministry to which he felt himself moved by the Spirit of God, which from childhood had been the object of his fondest hopes, and of the hopes of his friends,—for which his father had, with a solicitude and pious care rarely exhibited, sought to prepare him—for which during long years he had studied and watched and prayed—foregoing even the innocent recreations of youth, and counting nought else dear to him in comparison with being thoroughly furnished for the good work. Now just on the threshold of the ministry,—with the object of his hopes almost within his grasp,—he is sternly asked by those who have authority to test his qualifications, what he will do if all the plans of his life are frustrated, and all the hopes of his devoted father and anxious friends are disappointed? What he will do, (ay, in all future time, for there is no limit set by the question,) if the call to the ministry which his heart has so long recognised and cherished, shall be suppressed by the mandate of ecclesiastical power! *What will he do? Will he seek the ministry of the Church of Rome?* To such a question what could he reply? Alas, I knew too well the infirmities of my nature to anticipate that reply,—yet he nobly escaped the pitfall laid for his conscience. In that trying moment he retained his self command. He did not answer, as did Hazael, when the prophet predicted his career of crime and blood, "*Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this great thing?*" Nor yet did he say like that disciple who afterward denied his Master, "*Lord, though all men should be offended because of thee, yet will not I be offended;*" but in meekness and fear, mindful of the words of wisdom, "he that trusteth his own heart is a fool," he answered for the *present*, and not for the *future*, except to express humbly his trust that he should remain a layman in his own communion. He would not for all time to come, and in view of his trying circumstances set before him by the question, presumptuously say what might be *possible* or *impossible* for him, a frail creature, to do or to suffer. He would be content to declare for the present, that he loved his Church,—he felt it to be his home,—and had no inclination to depart from it. The calm wisdom of the answer exceeded even the cruelty of the question.

Did he not, however, in answer to the other question referred to, say that in his opinion, the differences between us and the Church of Rome are not such as *embrace points of faith?* Certainly he did, and I cannot conceive what other answer the most ultra Protestant could desire. The error of Rome lies in her additions to the *fundamental faith*—which fundamental faith is common to us and her. For example, the Creed of Pius IV. contains the Nicene Creed, and thus far there is *no* "difference" between us and Rome—the "differences" begin with and are constituted, by the additions to the Nicene Creed contained in the Creed of Pius. Now do these differences, these *additions* embrace points of faith? *Are they points of faith?* i. e., of the essential faith, or not? A Romanist would answer that these additions to what we hold as the faith—these "differences" between his own and a Protestant Church, *are* points of faith, which if a man do not receive, let him be anathema. Mr. Carey, on the contrary, answered in effect as every Churchman surely must answer, "No! *they are not in my opinion points of faith.*" The question was certainly in itself not a very precise one; its position, however, in the order of examination, served, as I thought, to determine its exact intention; i. e., that of ascertaining the estimation in which the candidate held the standards of the Roman Church, especially in points wherein they differ from the standards of our Church. This question immediately follows that in which he is asked, "Do you hold to or receive the decrees of the Council of Trent?" And as the effect of the exception taken by him to the damnatory clauses, seemed not to be apprehended by the two gentlemen who proposed the test, I supposed the question under consideration to be intended as a further test on the same point; i. e., *the extent of the candidate's respect for the Romish standards*. It now appears, however, that the sense which the candidate meant to convey, was by some unaccountable process *reversed* in the minds of the two reverend authors of the pamphlet, to the great detriment and wrong, not only of the candidate, but of all concerned in his examination and subsequent ordination.

But aside from these details, how did it happen that if Mr. Carey is really above the suspicion of Romish tendencies, his examination should be *so filled with Romanism?* Why did not he, as do other candidates at the ordinary examination for deacons' orders, simply give an account of his faith as a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church, without entering into those innumerable refinements, and explanations, and distinctions which marked his answers respecting the tenets of the Church of Rome? It all happened in this wise:—A simple account of his faith as a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church was not sought by his two chief examiners on this occasion! *They filled the examination with Romanism*, and rendered necessary every explanation, and every refinement, and every distinction of Mr. Carey by their crude and torturing questions. This was not the ordinary examination of a candidate for deacons' orders; Mr. Carey had already sustained *that* satisfactorily to his examiners, and creditably to himself. This was a special examination, to the appointment of which the bishop was moved by the representations of one, I believe, of the reverend authors of the "True Issue," that the reverend author had heard a *rumor*, which, nourished by the prejudices of the day, had acquired an imposing tone when it reached him. He conversed with Mr. Carey on the subject of the *rumor*, and recorded (as far as memory served) the conversation. He then, in the Board of Trustees of the Seminary, expressed his conviction that there is in that institution an "undercurrent of *Romanism*," and rather hastily (as many thought) *pledged himself* to sustain his assertion before the Church if necessary, by documentary proof,—which documentary proof was understood to be the record of his conversations with Mr. Carey.—When the special examination was ordered, and this gentleman and his friend were appointed as two of the examiners, it doubtless appeared necessary to them to redeem the pledge which had been given before the Trustees, and to confirm the representations which had been made to the bishop. With no *intention*, of course, of doing the slightest injustice to Mr. Carey, or of eliciting any thing but *truth*, they were nevertheless in *fact* (one of them at least was) *committed to the issue, and bound to prove him a Romanist, or strongly inclined to Romanism, if it could be done.* The prepared and condensed, though not *precise* questions which they brought with them to the examination, were confined to topics connected with the Church of Rome,—having respect not merely to the acknowledged abuses and corruptions, but to the entire doctrinal and disciplinary system of that Church, *and to their own views of that system.* Mr. Carey, therefore, did not choose his own topics, nor express his sentiments upon those topics in his own way, nor give to the examination the color of his own mind. He must answer strictly the question proposed, however vague and imperfect it might be. Any departure from the crude letter would be deemed an evasion; and the slightest remonstrance would supply food for suspicion. The task was his, fettered as he stood before the Committee, to extricate if he could, not only his *faith*, but the speculations at any time indulged by his ardent mind, and the casual remarks, not only which *he had made*, but those which he *might possibly have made* in the freedom of social intercourse,—from the strong and cunning hand of a zeal backed by popular prejudice, which seemed resolved to force him, against the pleadings of reason and of humanity, from his native fold to that of Rome.

Mark how an idle rumor has brought evil upon the Church! The rumor prepared the way for an *adventurous assertion* in the Board of Trustees of the Seminary, and elsewhere. The adventurous assertion rendered the *solemn pledge* necessary. The pledge rendered the *peculiar process* of the special examination necessary. In the opinion of six of the examiners, and of the bishop, no Romanism was proved upon the candidate—*the pledge was not yet accounted to have been redeemed.* Then the *protest* against the bishop's decision became necessary. The protest brought the matter before the public; and straightway friends and enemies, the daily and the weekly, the secular and the religious press, became clamorous for an explanation. Then came forth that most astounding production of the age, "The True Issue for the True Churchman."

I feel bound to apologize to you, and to your readers, for the length to which my remarks have been extended. I did not intend to enter into the details of the examination, your own clear statement having rendered it unnecessary. It came in my way, however, to notice two of the questions, and the answers thereto; but I shall proceed no further. If men, who ever listen to reason or to conscience, can read your exposure *specifically, point by point*, of the misrepresentations which have subjected our bishop and six of his presbyters, together with a worthy young clergyman, to injustice and opprobrium before the world, and affirm without shame, that the validity of the published accusation is still unshaken, and that no particular misrepresentation has been shown, why nothing that I or any man can add, will be of any avail. Or if men who would be thought just and honorable will excuse themselves from a candid and attentive perusal of your editorials on this subject, by branding them with coarse epithets, and yourself with the nicknames of Puseyite and Romanist—these same *just* men, and *honorable*, will doubtless have an epithet and a nickname ready for me, wherewith to destroy, if possible, my efficiency even in the vindication of outraged truth and justice.

I am, Rev. and dear Sir,
Very truly yours,
EDWARD Y. HIGBEE.

For the Churchman.

Mr. Editor,—The point on which there appears to have existed in the public mind, and I am sorry to add the Episcopal portion of it, a doubt is, whether Drs. Smith and Anthon were or were not authorized, under a sound construction of the Rubric, to enter a public protest to the ordination of Mr. Carey, on the ground of error in his theological opinions. Your own able and lucid explanations were perfectly satisfactory to my own mind, and I happen to know they were to the minds of many others. But still, as I frequently heard gentlemen, in whose general intelligence I had full confidence, deny the correctness of the position you maintained, I thought I would do on this, as I frequently have done with great advantage on other disputed points, refer to that most excellent work, Bishop Brownell's Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer; a work, let me say in passing, which should be in the hands of every pious Churchman. He will find it a magazine of sound and useful instruction in all that concerns the doctrine, discipline and worship of the Church. Allow me to lay before your readers the commentary of Dr. Nichols, Bishop Beveridge, and Mr. Brewster, together with the question put by the bishop at the time of the ordination, and the rubric. The italics and capitals are my own:

"Then the bishop shall say unto the people: (7)

Brethren, if there be *any of you* who knoweth any impediment or notable crime in any of these persons presented to be ordered deacons, for the which he ought not to be admitted to the office, let him come forth in the name of God, and show what the *crime* or impediment is.

If any GREAT CRIME or impediment be objected, (8) (by the PEOPLE AS SUCH, I take it for granted, THEY ONLY having been addressed by the bishop,) the bishop shall cease from ordering that person, until such time as the party accused shall be found clear of that *crime*."

(7) "This inquiring of *the people*, concerning the *worthiness* of the person to be ordained, or whether *they* know any thing *ill* concerning him, is agreeable to the earliest practice of antiquity, and the word of God itself. For the apostle enjoins, that none exercise the office of a deacon who is not found 'blameless.' 1 Tim. 3: 10. And in the first institution of the deacons' order, the *brethren* were to vouch for the *good character* of the persons who were to undertake that office: 'Brethren, look out among you some men of *honest report*.' Acts 1: 3. And afterwards it continued a practice in the Church, that when any deacon, or especially any of the superior orders of priest or bishop, were nominated or notified to *the people*, they in testimony of his *abilities and good behavior*, were used to cry out, '*He is worthy*.' From this usage the Greek and Latin Churches have inserted in their liturgies forms for *the people* to declare the *worthiness* of the person to be ordained."—*Dr. Nichols.*

"If any of *the people* know any impediment or *notable crime* in any of the persons to be ordained, for which he ought not to be received into the ministry, it is ***THEIR*** *fault if he be ordained, for* ***THEY*** *may hinder it if they will*: nay, they are bound to do it, by discovering what objections they have against it: whence it may be observed by the way, that whatsoever DISORDERLY or UNWORTHY PERSONS are admitted to 'holy orders, *the people* must not blame the bishop, but themselves, or those that know them, for it. For it cannot be supposed that he should have the *personal knowledge* of every one that comes to him for orders: all that he can do, is to inquire of *them*, and consider what credit is to be given to the letters testimonial which they bring to him, wherein it may be possible for him to be imposed upon. But they who do not personally know them, but know them to be of so WICKED AND LOOSE A CONVERSATION, that they ought not to be received into the ministry, and yet do not acquaint the bishop with it, *either before* or when he requires *them* to do it in the face of the congregation, ought to bear all the blame now, and must answer for it another day."—*Bishop Beveridge.*

(8) "If it should so happen, that the bishop for some alleged cause should cease from ordering any particular person, let it be observed that he still acts under the impression of Christian forbearance. Though under such a circumstance it would be indiscreet and improper to proceed to the ordination of a person *charged with offence*, it is charitably supposed that he may be innocent of the accusation: and therefore the ceremony is suspended, 'until such time as the party accused shall be found clear of that *crime*.'"—*Brewster.*

Now, Mr. Editor, duly considering the force of the foregoing commentaries, how shall we escape the conclusion that the bishop, or other proper ecclesiastical authority, having duly examined and inquired into the soundness of the candidate in the "faith," and of his sufficiency in literary attainments, "to render him apt and meet to exercise the ministry to the glory of God and the edifying of his Church;" that the bishop at the time of ordination calls upon *the people as such*, and not upon the clergy, for the discovery of any *moral delinquencies*, of which they may know the candidate to be guilty, and of which the bishop would be entirely ignorant? It is certainly not the province of the *people* to be *official judges* in matters of "faith," or even of mere matters of "opinion" not affecting the integrity of the "faith," as summed up in the Nicene Creed and the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church. But it might well happen, and it is doubtless upon this presumption that the question is founded, that the people might know of *moral delinquencies* which, whatever may be his soundness in the "faith," or his general correctness in mere matters of *opinion*, should be known to the bishop, and which should exclude the candidate from ordination. I have more to say on this whole subject, Mr. Editor, but knowing as I do how great is the demand upon your columns, I will for the present forbear.

"AN OLD CHURCHMAN."

For the Churchman.

My dear Churchman,—That there should be great excitement on the subject of the supposed tendencies in our Church to Romanism is not surprising, for the public are always on the tiptoe of desire for some cause for excitement; but how the members of our Church should, to so great an extent, partake of it, I could not at first conceive. On reflection, I fancy I can account for it; and as the subject appears of importance, in leading us to turn from our errors, I will state my views, and if you also conceive them to be important, you can give them a place in your honest, faithful, and powerful Churchman. Do not suppose that I think our own Church generally partakes of this mad excitement. No, no! Doubtless when we look at the agitated state of the surface, we might be excused for fearing without reflection that the whole waters of the Church were turned into foam and froth, without reflecting that, (and thanking God that it is so,) there are many fathoms of pure, clear and peaceful water below. But I will state my reasons for the unchurchmanlike excitement with which we are now disturbed.

First, I suppose it to arise from the strange neglect of catechising our children, according to our Church's requirements, and of teaching them the true and distinctive principles of our Church. The lambs have not been fed, and they have grown up weak and wild sheep, or rather, not sheep but goats. They have been turned over to the Sunday school, to save the time and strength of the ministers, for the use of the older persons. Alas! what an error! How can time and strength be used to so good advantage, as in feeding the lambs? Had the present generation been thus taught, they would now know what Church truth is, and would not be frightened by a bugbear, nor betray such sad ignorance as not to know the difference between Jerusalem and Rome, nor be guilty of putting the torch to the beauties of the Catholic Church, fancying them the excrescences of the Papal Church.

Secondly, I suppose it to arise from the spirit of amalgamation with, conformity to, and seeking the approbation of, those without the Church, which has so prevailed of late years among us. There was a time, and, although I was not then of the Church, I marked it, when Churchmen were satisfied to be Churchmen, if they were good and consistent Churchmen. If they were ridiculed and persecuted, they expected it, and heeded it not; and if the cry of Rome and Popery was raised against them, (and oh! it *was* raised, and shouted, and right bitterly too,) what then? They were not frightened nor driven to prove themselves not Churchmen, by attempting to prove themselves not Papists. But since then, many have not felt satisfied with being Churchmen, but have rather wished to be considered not Churchmen, at least not to any good purpose, and, in some instances, the wish has plainly been, not to be Churchmen except in name. Formerly it was not attempted, because impossible, to make the Church popular. Of late the attempt has been carried so far, that in certain places all that rendered the Church peculiar and distinctive has been broken down, and a dead level has been struck between Church and Dissenters, (forgive the word this once,) their approbation has been courted, their standard of piety has been set up for ourselves, and their discountenance has been regarded as alarming. Now this is not only unchurchlike, but unchristianlike. It is *truth*, not *popularity*—it is God's, not man's approbation, which we ought to be anxious for. And now when the various denominations cry against us "Popery," we are alarmed.

Third, I suppose it to arise from our joining in the popular outcry against Rome. This has too often been not for conscience' sake, but through fear for popularity's sake. We have not simply been grieved at the errors, and sighing over the corruptions of a part of our Lord's body, but felt rather a partisan hatred, and a cowardly shame. An unmeaning outcry has been raised, simply lest we should suffer persecution. Now why,—I ask it frankly, fearlessly,—why should we be ashamed of a relationship to the Romish Church? How much of this shame has no better source than because she is unpopular? Are the errors of Rome more dangerous than the denial of our Lord's divinity—the reality of his atonement, or the influences of the Holy Spirit? Yet, are we as ashamed to be associated with the holders of these points, as with the Roman Catholics? Which, ecclesiastically speaking, is most destructive to Christ's visible Church on earth, Popery or Congregationalism? Is it not surely the latter? Yet do we hoot and hiss it down as we do the former? What is the Church of Rome? I mean really, not popularly. What is it? It is a branch of the true Church. It is a part of the body of our Lord, and who can deny it? It being such, are we not partakers with that multitude who of old dragged his body to death, crying, "Away with him, crucify him?" Is it not that we are now ashamed of him,—of what is, in part, his body,—his Church?

And now, Mr. Churchman, if we have smuggled in, or led hoodwinked into our Church, or reared up among us those who are not in sympathy with old and true Churchmanship, (and I believe it will be found that about one half of our clergy even, are from without the Church; I am told it is so in our diocese,*) if it be so, what are we to do? Shall we modernize our ecclesiastical architecture? Shall we remodel the good old Church? Shall we down with our old standards, and conform new ones to their taste, or must they conform to the real standards of the Church? Again, shall we continue to hiss and hoot at, and cry "Away with it," to what must be acknowledged to be a part of the true Church? Or shall we sorrow for and sigh over the corruptions and diseases of our Lord's body,

"And weep in sorrow o'er its wounds
We lack the power to heal!"

Shall we by hatred drive from us our brethren of that part of the body, to make infidels smile, or shall we rather, to please God, draw them by love to us from their errors? As enemies we cannot reach them, as brethren we may. If we thus suffer for righteousness' sake, happy are we. If we are hooted at as Romanists, amen to it; God, and not they, is our judge. Let us be mindful not to expend our strength against Rome; we shall lose our labor if it *is* Christ's Church, and be found fighting with the forces of the gates of hell. But with "the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God," "praying always," let us by the truth in love, attack Popery unto the death, and the many other corruptions which, like egregious network, the Popes have thrown over our Lord's body.

City Point, Boston, August 10, 1843.

---

* It is often, as the late Chief Justice of Connecticut, Daggett, said, that "those who get Episcopacy by inoculation, have it harder than those who have it the natural way." This is so when it results from conviction, and not from expediency.

For the Churchman.

Mr. Editor,—I was much struck with a remark made lately to me by a Presbyterian lady whose piety and intelligence make her a valued member of the communion to which she is attached. I asked her if she had read Dr. Pusey's famous sermon. She replied in the affirmative. I asked her whether she found any thing very wrong in its doctrines. She ingenuously rejoined, that before she could speak intelligently on that point, *she must find out what her own doctrines were.*

The idea at once occurred to me, that although there may not always be equal frankness in expressing themselves, a very large number of dissenters, and a large number of Church-people also, if they will meet the subject as one of great solemnity and importance ought to be met, will find that they have thought so little of the principles and truths connected with evangelical views of the holy eucharist, as hardly to have embraced the subject within their system of religious belief. My excellent friend promised to give to it more serious consideration than she had ever yet done. And such we may hope will be, by God's blessing, the result on many serious minds of the present agitation, touching not only the eucharist, but also other solemn and important subjects that have been too much neglected.

B. T. N.

For the Churchman.

Mr. Editor,—I wish you could have heard Bishop Whittingham's sermon at the consecration of Bishop Henshaw. It was truly a master-piece of eloquence, and, as was to be expected from *him*, admirably sound and able in its theological views. It was especially *seasonable*, setting forth the consolations and supports which, in this age of rebuke and blasphemy, true faith ministers to those who dare, in spite of the ungodly clamors of the mixed antagonistic multitude, stand up fearlessly for Christ and His Church; and powerfully pressing the Christian obligation of waxing stronger and stronger in that faith, to guard against flinching from duty, or giving in to unholy concession and compromise, because of those clamors, however bold and insolent. The sermon is to be published, and I hope it will be extensively read and pondered.

I am so far, Mr. Editor, a fashionable man, as to spend much of this season of the year *in transitu*. This has given me an opportunity of observing how very generally your course in the matter of the present extensive outcry against the Church, is approved by the soundest and most intelligent of our clergy and laity. This I find to be the case far and near, in your own diocese and in others. Even where the "Statement" at first very naturally produced alarm, the entire demolition of its pretence to respect and confidence is producing a strong and extensive reaction in favor of those whom it traduces.

By the way, it has suited the malcontents to give out that your paper and the Banner are the only Church papers which do not sympathize with them. *Perhaps* they were ignorant of the stand taken for the Church by the Utica Gospel Messenger and the True Catholic. If so, will they have the honesty, when they find it out, to say that *four* of our papers condemn them? The Southern Gospel Messenger I have not seen since *these troubles*; but think there can be little doubt where *it* will be found when the Church is assailed.

E. R. O.

THE CHURCHMAN.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 19, 1843.

APPEAL TO AUTHORITIES.

The Courier and Enquirer, which an exchange paper* refers to as "the organ of the whole Evangelical or Low Church party," the New World, the Episcopal Recorder, the Southern Churchman, the Church Chronicle, and the Christian Witness, continue to be scandalized at Bishop Onderdonk's not having made the denial of the decrees of Trent a condition of ordination.

Now a plain man might ask, What has a bishop of our Church to do with the decrees of Trent? The denial of them is nowhere made a requisite for orders in our Church. Our own standards, especially our Liturgy and Articles, have been hitherto deemed sufficient to guard us from error; why are they not so now? Are we wiser than our fathers, that we cannot repose on the same platform of Catholic truth, but must erect new tests of orthodoxy, and invent new badges of sectarianism?

And a prudent man might ask the objectors to particularize the decrees of Trent, the denial of which is to be erected into a condition of ordination. What an apple of discord would be thus thrown into the editorial conclave! The Christian Witness, who gives his equivocal support to Dr. Croswell for baptizing Mr. Hewitt, might make an exception in favor of the Tridentine Canon which declares the baptism given by heretics to be true baptism. The Chronicle of the Church would stand aghast at the thought of making a denial of Primitive Episcopacy (as defined in Sess. xxiii. Can. 6) a condition for Holy Orders. The Southern Churchman and Episcopal Recorder would be horrified to require a candidate to deny the decree (Sess. vi. chap. 8) which affirms that "neither faith nor works deserve the grace of justification." The Courier and Enquirer, when he was informed that an *indulgence* was an act of mercy on the part of an executive officer releasing an offender from a penalty which he had incurred by a breach of law, would doubtless be sufficiently magnanimous not to vote *for turning the bishop out of office*, because he did not insist on the denial of Indulgences. The New World would probably be more consistent: he might perchance snap his fingers at the decree of the fourth session, which declares that all the books of the Old and New Testament are to be received with the same affection and reverence, since one GOD is the author of both, and even shout hurra for Luther and John Milton, when he came to the second canon on Matrimony, which declares it to be unlawful for Christians to have more wives than one.

We have endeavored to explain to these journals that the Decrees of Trent, when taken by themselves, are capable of a very different and much milder construction from that which they receive when taken in connection with the Romish system; and we have also called their attention to the fact that Romanism essentially consists, not in the doctrine contained in the decrees of Trent, but in the binding of that doctrine (as interpreted by the Romish system) on the conscience, as part of the Christian faith. At all this they merely laugh or scold. The Courier and Enquirer is still positive that the bishop ought to be turned out of the Church for ordaining a man who believes that the faithful departed may be benefited by the prayers of the faithful on earth. The Church Chronicle oracularly declares, that "if the things mentioned in the Creed of Pius IV. do not make the things therein mentioned, 'points of faith,' [pray what is meant by the things mentioned making the things mentioned?] we are unable to conceive of any language that would render them such." The Christian Witness mistakes the mention of a fact for an effort of logic, and gravely sets himself to prove that it is vastly "illogical" in the Churchman to declare that Romanism essentially consists in binding scholastic subtleties and controverted points on the conscience as matters of faith. The Episcopal Recorder, with a sense of truth perfectly unique and characteristic, stoutly declares that the Statement of the two doctors has been in no particular contradicted; and that "while falsehood is repeatedly and directly charged by the writers in the Churchman on Drs. Smith and Anthon, no one presumes to lay his finger on the falsehood and say *there it is*."

Thus it is, that these editors play into the hands of the Papists; who always declare that they are responsible only for the decrees of Trent, and whose great art in controversy consists in diverting attention from their practical corruptions, and leading the assailant to attack those guarded doctrinal definitions which are their strongest entrenchment.

We have no intention of going over our former ground, and insisting again on those obvious explanations and distinctions which are very pardonably condemned as "quibbling," and as "metaphysical argumentation," by those who have never been used to them. There is, however, another argument, and that is, the argument from authorities: we shall show, as fully as a very brief space allows, that the best divines in the Church are against them.

We advert first, to the case of Mr., afterwards Bishop Montague. In the year 1624, a short pamphlet was printed in England, by one of the emissaries of the Pope, entitled a "New Gag for the Old Gospel," which pretended to confute the Reformed out of their own English Bibles. In examining the work, Montaghe perceived that several points of Calvinism, never owned by the Church of England, were charged upon her; and those tenets peculiar to Puritanism he disclaimed, in an answer to the Popish book. The answer of Montague gave great umbrage to the Puritans, and led to his impeachment in the House of Commons, by a Committee on Religion, (the first that ever sat in that house,) of which Mr. Pym was chairman, which is given entire by Collier, vol. ii. p. 736, &c., and contains, among others, the following specifications:

---

* The New York Freeman's Journal: a source, we confess, to which we do not much like to be indebted, but whose apposite remarks on the present matter we are tempted to quote:

"It is hard for us to describe the excitement which this matter has caused in New York. It is still harder to account for it, unless by the meddling disposition of our community. A difference occurs between some Episcopalian clergymen; it gets into print, and incontinently the whole good-natured public become profoundly interested, and hasten with all the alacrity of schoolboys in a scuffle, to take sides immediately. The newspapers catch the contagion, and follow the example. The *Commercial Advertiser* and the *Journal of Commerce* are, of course, down upon every thing which they think to have the remotest squinting towards Popery: but it surprises us that a newspaper like the *Courier and Enquirer* should be found stirring the bitter ingredient of religious polemics into the caldron of politics, already bitter enough for most men's tastes. Now, if there be one journal in the city whose general course, evident policy, and settled character as a mercantile and political paper, completely unfit it for interfering in matters of this sort, it is most decidedly the *Courier*. Yet we find it, in that slashing, imperious style, for which it is at least as well known as for its ability, setting itself up as the organ of the whole Evangelical or Low Church party, talking with an air of "our Church," &c.—*N. Y. Freeman's Journal.*

"Whereas in the same Homily it is likewise declared, that the Church of Rome is not built upon the foundations of the Prophets and Apostles; and in the eight and twentieth Article of the said [xxxix] Articles, that Transubstantiation overthroweth the nature of a sacrament; and in the five and twentieth of the said Articles, that five other of the reputed sacraments of the Church of Rome are not to be accounted sacraments; yet contrary and repugnant hereunto, he, the said Richard Montague, doth maintain and affirm in his book aforesaid, called "The Answer to the Gag," that the Church of Rome hath ever remained firm upon the same foundation of sacraments and doctrine instituted by God.

"In the nineteenth of the same Articles [the xxxix] it is further determined, that the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and matters of ceremony, but also in matters of faith. He the said Richard Montague, speaking of those points which belong to faith and good manners, hope and charity, doth in the said book called the Gag affirm and maintain, that none of these are controverted in their points, meaning the Protestants and Papists; and notwithstanding that in the one and thirtieth Article it is resolved, that the Sacrifice of Masses in which as it is commonly said the priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain and guilt too, is a blasphemous fable and dangerous deceit; this being one of the points controverted between the Church of England and the Church of Rome: the said Richard Montague in his book called 'The Gag,' doth affirm and maintain, that the controverted points are of a lesser and inferior nature, of which a man may be ignorant without any danger of his soul at all; a man may resolve to oppose this or that without peril of perishing forever."

It is easy to see from this, what the judgment of such men as Pym and Prynne would be in Mr. Carey's case; and we have only to turn to another page in the history to see what would be the judgment of the most distinguished bishops of the same age, Buckeridge, Howson, and Laud. Having premised that they were no strangers to the person of Mr. Montague, but that it was the cause they were bound to be tender of, these bishops proceed in terms which deserve to pondered by those who would understand the true genius of our Church:

"The cause, we conceive, (under correction of better judgment,) concerns the Church of *England* merely; for that Church, when it was reformed from the superstitions broached or maintained by the Church of *Rome*, refused the apparent and dangerous errors, and would not be too busy with every particular school-point. The cause why she held this moderation, was, because she could not be able to preserve any unity amongst Christians, if men were forced to subscribe to curious particulars disputed in schools.

"Now, may it please your grace, the opinions which at this time trouble many men in the late book of Mr. Montague, are some of them such as are expressly the resolved doctrine of the Church of England, and those he is bound to maintain: some of them such as are fit only for schools, and to be left at more liberty for learned men to abound in their own sense, so they keep themselves peaceable and distract not the Church. And therefore to make any man subscribe to school opinions, may justly seem hard in the Church of Christ, and was one great fault of the Council of Trent. And to affright men from those opinions, in which they have (as they are bound) subscribed to the Church, as it is worse in itself, so it may be the mother of greater danger."—*Ibid.* p. 734.

So far as the Articles restrained their liberty, the three bishops were willing to be bound; but they were not willing, it seems, to deprive Mr. Montague of his right to opinions which Mr. Pym and the Puritans deemed repugnant to the Articles. So far as the Articles restrained his liberty, Bishop Onderdonk was willing to be bound; but he was not willing to deprive Mr. Carey of his right, as a candidate or clergyman, to opinions which Drs. Smith and Anthon deemed repugnant to the Articles.

The Christian Witness quotes the Roman Creed in reference to the seven sacraments "instituted by JESUS CHRIST our Lord, and necessary for the salvation of mankind, though not all for every one."

The first book of our Homilies, however, terms matrimony a sacrament; "by like holy promise, *the sacrament of matrimony* knitteth man and wife in perpetual love." The second book of Homilies speaks of *ordination* and "other sacraments," *besides* baptism and the Eucharist.

"It seems in fact," says Mr. Palmer, "that the Church of England has refrained from limiting the use of the term sacrament, and left her theologians in this respect, to that ancient liberty, of which the Synod of Trent has deprived the Roman theologians."

Archbishop Cranmer, in his Catechism, calls absolution a sacrament.

"It is none of the doctrine of the Church of England," says Bishop Taylor, "that there are two sacraments only; but that of those rituals commanded in Scripture, which the ecclesiastical use calls sacraments (by a word of art) two only are generally necessary to salvation." See Palmer, who also quotes Archbishop Secker to the same effect.

These we hold to be pretty good authorities to show that a belief in seven sacraments is no obstacle to ordination.

But the Witness, we observe, italicizes the words *necessary to salvation*, as if the offence lay in this point. We wish the writer had explained himself. Does he mean to say that orders are not necessary to the preaching of the Gospel, and through it to the salvation of mankind? that absolution is unnecessary for the penitent; confirmation for the baptized; and matrimony for those who would fulfil the ends of the institution? For our own part we should be ashamed of such licentious doctrine. Our Catechism teaches that two only of the sacraments are *generally* necessary to salvation; necessary for all and singular to whom the Gospel is preached; but this surely does not bind us to believe that other sacraments, say *orders* and *matrimony*, are in no sense necessary to the salvation of mankind.

The Christian Witness quotes from the Roman creed, "That in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead," and thinks this tenet a disqualification for orders in our Church.

Bishop Overall, one of the translators of our Bible, and *the author of the latter part of our Church Catechism*, or that which relates to the Sacraments, and therefore, (we hope we are not now "illogical,") as good a witness of our Church's meaning and of her requirements for orders, as the editors of the Christian Witness and the Courier and Enquirer, thus expresses himself in his Comment on the Communion Service in the first Prayer-book of Edward VI.

"'*We and all thy whole Church.*' This is a plain oblation of CHRIST's death once offered, and a representative sacrifice of it for the sins and for the benefit of the whole world, of the whole Church: that both those which are here on earth, and those which rest in the sleep of peace, being departed in the faith of Christ, may find the effect and virtue of it. And if the authority of the ancient Church may prevail with us, as it ought to do, there is nothing more manifest than that it always taught as much. * * * And in this sense, it is not only an eucharistical, but a propitiatory sacrifice; and to prove it a sacrifice propitiatory, always so acknowledged by the ancient Church, there can be no better argument than that it was offered up not only for the living but for the dead, and for those that were absent, for them that travelled, for Jews, for heretics, &c., who could have no other benefit of it, but as it was a propitiatory sacrifice; and that they did thus offer it, read a whole army of fathers. Nos autem ita comparati sumus ut cum tasse multis et magnis authoribus errare malimus quam cum Puritanis verum dicere. Not that it makes any propitiation as that of the cross did, but only that it obtains and brings into act that propitiation which was once made by CHRIST."

And commenting on the rubric in the English service, (which is left out in ours,) that "there shall be no celebration of the Lord's Supper except there be a convenient number to communicate with the priest according to his discretion," Bishop Overall adds:

"This was made against the Solitariæ Missæ that the Papists are now-days content withal. It was an abuse springing up about Charlemagne's time (it seems) to have the priest communicate and say mass though there were none to celebrate with him. Therefore the Council of Nice then made a canon against it: "Nullus presbyter solus missam cantare valet recte ut nobis videtur. Quomodo enim dicet 'Dominus Vobiscum.'" They say yet 'ut nobis videtur;' fain would they have had the abuse amended, and yet the communion not neglected for all that. They knew not well whether they should forbid it absolutely and simply if there were no company; *as indeed better were it to endure the absence of the people, than for the minister to neglect the usual and daily sacrifice of the Church, by which all people, whether they be there or no, reap so much benefit.*"

The Christian Witness quotes the Roman creed that "there is a purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful;" and the Courier and Enquirer thinks that Bishop Onderdonk should be separated from the Church for ordaining a man who believes that the faithful departed may be benefited by the prayers of the faithful on earth.

Bishop Cosins, however, tells us that our Church agrees with the Church of Rome, "In giving thanks to God for them that are departed out of this life in the true faith of Christ's Catholic Church, and in praying to God that they may have a joyful resurrection, and a perfect consummation of bliss both in their bodies and souls in his eternal kingdom."

To these topics of prayer for the faithful departed Dean Field adds, "and the perfecting of whatsoever is yet wanting in them." The same, as is well known, was the sentiment of Bishops Andrewes, Overall, Bull, &c., and of Hammond, Thorndike, Leslie, &c., all of whom would, beyond a doubt, have commended our American Church for having omitted the words "on earth," which, at the instance of Bucer and the foreign Reformers, have been stuck in the English Prayer-book after the introductory sentence, "Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church militant." The Church, whether on earth or in Paradise, continues and will continue in her militant, until she shall have entered, after the Resurrection, into her triumphant or glorified state; and as there is no prescription to limit the petitions *Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done*, to the Church "on earth," there can be no good reason for such a limitation in the like petitions in the Communion Office and other parts of our Prayer-book.

This is the doctrine of our ablest divines. Wherein then do they differ from Rome? Let the same Bishop Cosins state the point of difference:

"That there is a Purgatory after this life, wherein the souls of the dead *are punished, and from whence they are fetched out* by the prayers and offerings of the living; and that there is no salvation possibly to be had by any that will not believe as much."

The difference in the two statements is obvious. The latter is notoriously the received doctrine of Romanists and the foundation of their masses for the dead, which are performed for *bringing souls out of purgatory considered as a state of punishment.* But this abominable and licentious doctrine which the Church of Rome practically upholds, and for which she is justly responsible, she craftily covers in her creed under words which may mean no more than that the souls of the faithful after their departure hence, are preserved in a state of purity and bliss until they shall attain to the perfect consummation of their joys, both in body and soul, in the kingdom of glory.

Again, the Christian Witness quotes from the Roman creed, "that the saints reigning together with Christ, are to be honored and invocated, and that they offer prayers to God for us," as if agreement with the Church of Rome on this point should be accounted a disqualification for orders in our own Church. It certainly was not so accounted by Archbishop Bramhall, who says:

"Concerning the 'intercessions, prayers, merits of the saints," (taking the word 'merit' in the sense of the Primitive Church, that is, not for *desert*, but for *acquisition*,) I know no difference about them among men who understand themselves, but only about the last words, 'which they invocate in their temples, rather than churches.' A comprecation both the Grecians and we allow; an ultimate invocation both the Grecians and we detest; so do the Church of Rome in their doctrine, but they vary from it in their practice."

Nor by honest Hugh Latimer, who says:

"Take saints for inhabitants of heaven, and worshipping of them for praying to them, I never denied but they might be worshipped and be our mediators, though not by way of redemption, (for so Christ alone is a whole Mediator, both for them and for us,) yet by way of intercession."

To which we may add the words of Bishop Pearson, "We cannot bear too reverend a regard unto the Mother of our Lord, so long as we give her not that worship which is due unto our Lord himself. Let us keep the language of the Primitive Church. Let her be honored and esteemed, let Him be worshipped and adored."—And the much stronger language of Bishop Andrews: "Making mention of the all-holy, undefiled, and more than the Blessed Mary, Mother of God, and Ever Virgin, with all Saints, let us commend ourselves and each other, and all our life, to Christ our God."

In what then do we condemn the Church of Rome on this head? We condemn her first for upholding a popular doctrine very different from her formal statement, and which is (in the language of Bishop Cosins) "That all the old saints departed, and all those dead men and women whom the Pope hath of late canonized for saints, or shall hereafter do so, whosoever they be, are and ought to be invocated by the religious prayers and devotions of all persons;" secondly, for the idolatrous worship of the saints set forth in her liturgies and practised in her churches; and thirdly, for making even her formal doctrine to be an article of the Christian faith and necessary to salvation.

The Christian Witness is scandalized that a man should be admitted to the ministry, who allows the veneration of relics; an expression which *may* mean no more than the respect which the Christian religion teaches us to pay to the bodies of departed saints; viz., that we should not burn them, as did the heathens, but reverently inter them in holy ground, in hopes of their joyful resurrection. Bishop Cosins is more discriminating in stating the point of difference; viz., "That the relics of all those true or reputed saints [including all whom the Pope has canonized] ought to be religiously worshipped; and that whosoever holdeth the contrary is damned."

The Christian Witness quotes from the Roman Creed, "that the images of CHRIST, and the Mother of God, ever Virgin, and also of other saints, ought to be had and retained, *and that due honor and veneration is to be given to them*;" himself italicizing the last clause. But if he make this doctrine a disqualification for orders in our Church, he decapitates Archbishop Tennison, who, as having lived since the "glorious Revolution," may be accounted sufficiently Protestant; and who says:

"Due honor and veneration are in themselves modest words; and where we admit the images and pictures of Christ, we refuse not the honor that is due to them. We do not choose to put them in vile places, we do not use them in vile offices; we esteem them as ornaments, we value them as the images of persons more honorable than our prince or our friend, we use them as remembrancers of the great mystery of man's redemption, which we cannot too frequently be reminded of."

Bishop Cosins, with a *little* more caution than the Witness, states the point of difference to be, that the images "are to be honored and worshipped *according to the use and practice of the Roman Church*; and that this is to be believed *as of necessity to salvation*."

The Christian Witness quotes from the Roman Creed, "that the power of indulgences was left by CHRIST in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people," accounting this also a disqualification for orders. In his synopsis of "our agreements" with the Church of Rome, Bishop Cosins inserts the following:

"In the use of Indulgences, or abating the rigor of the Canons imposed upon offenders according to their repentance, and their want of ability to undergo them."

And in his list of "the differences" he inserts the following:

"That the power and use of Indulgences, as they are now practised in the Church of Rome, both for the living and the dead, is to be received and held of all, under pain of eternal perdition."

"Indulgences," says the plausible Gother, in his 'Papist Misrepresented, and Represented,' "are nothing else but a mitigation or relaxation, upon just causes, of canonical penances."

"If by canonical penances," replies our learned bishop Stillingfleet, "they mean those enjoined by the penitential canons, Gregory de Valentia saith, This opinion differs not from that of the heretics, and makes indulgences to be useless and dangerous things. Bellarmine brings several arguments against this doctrine. 1. There would be no need of the treasure of the Church; which he had proved to be the foundation of indulgences. 2. They would be rather hurtful than profitable, and the Church would deceive her children. 3. They could not be granted for the dead. 4. They who received indulgences do undergo canonical penances. 5. The form of them doth express that they do relate to GOD, and not only to the Church. And this, I think, is sufficient to show how far he is from representing the true nature of indulgences; for we do not dispute the Church's power in relaxing canonical penances to penitent sinners upon just causes."

So different is the *real* doctrine of the Church of Rome, that which she practically binds upon her members and incorporates into her system, from the *professed* doctrine which she puts in her Creed. Long use has accustomed us to take the words *Mass, Purgatory, Invocation, Indulgences*, &c., to mean precisely what they do mean in the present popular doctrine and corrupt system of the Church of Rome. It is well for us, however, to remember that these words *may* be taken in another sense, and not to judge of the Church of Rome by her *professions only*, but by her *practice also*; lest while we think we are condemning Rome, we really condemn ourselves.

We have thus brought authorities to bear on *all* those points which the Christian Witness has particularized in his notice of Mr. Haight's "Letter to a Parishioner;" a notice which concludes as follows:

"All this Mr. Carey believes to be true; because whatever is 'not irreconcilable with the Catholic faith,' must be true. But all this Mr. Haight holds Mr. Carey responsible for, *only on the condition that the language be taken in its literal sense.* And surely this is the only sense in which it ought to be taken. But it is because language has been taken all along in its plain obvious sense, by Drs. Smith and Anthon, and the public generally, that so much denunciation and quibbling has been spread upon Dr. Seabury's and Mr. Haight's pages.

"Let it be no longer said that Mr. Carey has been misrepresented. His meaning is now fairly before the public. The issue is made up. It is whether a man who believes the objectionable articles just quoted from Pope Pius's Creed to be true, may lawfully be ordained in the Protestant Episcopal Church."

Perhaps when the editor sees that the rule by which he decides Mr. Carey's ordination to be unlawful, obliges him to condemn and to cast out as Papists Archbishops Cranmer, Bramhall, and Tennison; and Bishops Latimer, Overall, Andrewes, Buckeridge, Howson, Laud, Montague, Cosins, Pearson, Taylor, and Stillingfleet; or rather, we should say, all the really eminent divines of our Church, of whose sentiments the above extracts are specimens; we say when he sees this, he may be led to inquire whether the Tridentine decrees, when taken in the mere letter, may not have a widely different meaning from those same decrees when taken in connection with the Romish system.

P. S. The reader will observe that the above quotations are not made for the purpose of insisting on the correctness of the sentiments which they express. The object in quoting them is, to vindicate for the Bishop of this diocese that liberty which our Church allows, and for the exercise of which he has been so rudely and clamorously assailed.

We beg leave to thank our friends for their approbation, so lavishly expressed, of our recent course, and particularly for the substantial proofs of it received from various quarters; among which that of a friend in a Northwestern City deserves to be particularly acknowledged. His list of new subscribers (more than twenty in number) and draft for $60, came safe to hand. A similar favor from a friend at the South is also gratefully acknowledged. We regret that we are no longer able to furnish our new subscribers (as they desire) with back numbers from the first of July. We will, however, if desired, send them in their stead, Mr. Sparks's pamphlet, which will contain all the matter which has appeared in the Churchman relating to the ordination at St. Stephen's.

We dislike to call attention to articles on our last page, but we should be sorry that the reader should miss that headed "Puseyism in London," in which nothing will offend him but the first word in the title; a word against which every Churchman and every gentleman should seriously set his face.

EPISCOPAL VISITATION.—The Bishop's appointments for *Yonkers* and *Tuckahoe*, are postponed for the present on account of the temporary suspension, owing to indisposition, of the duties of the rector. A change has also been made in most of the appointments *after the Convention.*

INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT.—An old correspondent, to whom we are always happy to be indebted, has sent us the annexed slip from the Boston Mercantile Journal. The same judgment has been, from time to time, very decidedly expressed by the Christian Register, and also by the Christian World, Unitarian papers in Boston. The former has condemned, out and out, the conduct of Drs. Smith and Anthon, and declared (in a notice of the "True Issue") that "they are on the wrong side" if judged by the standards of their own Church, though on the right side for the interests of Unitarianism. The latter, also in review of "The True Issue," remarks:

"In every controversy in a Church at the present time, that party will triumph which seeks to carry out the real principles of the Church, whatever they are; that party which actually believes what it professes to believe; the party which is not in play but in earnest. * * * So in the Episcopal Church, the Oxford party, or Puseyites, must triumph, not because their principles are true, but because they are in earnest about them, and because they are the real principles of the Church. Low Church Episcopacy is not Episcopacy. The standards of the Church have always taught the doctrines of baptismal regeneration, of apostolic succession, justification by works, transubstantiation, [the real presence is meant,] and other Romish doctrines. But Churchmen have read them in their Prayer-books, and listened to them as though they were not there. They can do so no longer."

These remarks are good company for the following:

"Rev. Mr. Ellis, of Charlestown, an Unitarian Congregational Clergyman, in an able and learned discourse in his Church on Sunday evening upon the subject of Puseyism, took the ground that the tendency of the doctrines of Dr. Pusey and the Oxford tractarians is not towards Romanism, but Episcopalianism, which last, he said, was a compromise between the doctrines of the Puritans and those of the Roman Catholics—that since the Episcopal religion was established, concessions have from time to time been made to the Puritans by the Episcopalians, while the Roman Catholics have conceded nothing—and Puseyism, as it is called, is Episcopacy in its original form—and the efforts of the Oxford tractarians are directed towards re-establishing the Episcopal religion in all its pristine integrity.

"Many of the Episcopalians, however, deny that this is the case, and hence the present controversial warfare—in which commanding intellect, extensive learning, and consummate ability, are engaged."—*Boston Journal.*

DIOCESE OF RHODE ISLAND.

CONSECRATION OF THE BISHOP.

On Friday, August 11th, the Rev. John Prentiss Kemley Henshaw, D. D., Bishop-elect of Rhode Island, was consecrated in St. John's Church, Providence, in that diocese, by the Right Rev. Thomas C. Brownell, D. D., LL. D., Bishop of Connecticut, who was requested by the Presiding Bishop of the House of Bishops, necessarily absent, to preside on the occasion, assisted by the Rt. Rev. Benjamin T. Onderdonk, D. D., Bishop of New York, the Right Rev. John H. Hopkins, D. D., Bishop of Vermont, the Right Rev. George W. Doane, D. D., LL. D., Bishop of New Jersey, the Right Rev. William R. Whittingham, D. D., Bishop of Maryland, and the Right Rev. John Johns, D. D., Assistant Bishop of Virginia. Morning Prayer was read by the Rev. Nathan D. Crocker, D. D., Rector of St John's; and the Ante-Communion Service by the Presiding Bishop, assisted by the Assistant Bishop of Virginia, who read the Epistle, and the Bishop of Vermont, who read the Gospel. The sermon was preached by the Bishop of Maryland, who also, in conjunction with the Assistant Bishop of Virginia, presented the Bishop-elect to the Presiding Bishop. The evidence of the election, and the testimonial of the Convention of the Diocese, were read by the Rev. Azel D. Cole, Secretary of the Convention; the testimonials of the Standing Committees by the Rev. Henry Waterman, Secretary of the Standing Committee; and the evidence of the consent of the Bishops by the Rev. George W. Hathaway, President of the Standing Committee. The Litany was read by the Bishop of New Jersey. The Bishop-elect was assisted in putting on his episcopal habit by the Rev. George Taft, Rector of St. Paul's Church, North Providence, and the Rev. Francis Vinton, Rector of Trinity Church, Newport. After the consecration, the Bishop of New York performed the Communion Service to the end of the Trisagion, when it was resumed by the Presiding Bishop, who also performed all the portions of the ceremonial not particularly mentioned above, and who was assisted in the administration of the holy elements by all the bishops present.

Although the weather was unfavorable, the Church was much crowded, and between forty and fifty of the clergy were in attendance, the most of them in their official dress.

The letter ascribed to the Provincial Council of Roman Bishops in Baltimore, which expresses delight in the fancied approximation of a portion of our Church to the Church of Rome, has been exposed and denounced as a forgery: and yet it continues to be circulated by our religious papers.

We acknowledge with great pleasure the receipt of the "Extra," from Pittsburgh, containing the substance of the counter-statements which have been made to "The True Issue." The following is the preface, which may, we presume, be ascribed to the Rev. Dr. Upfold, who yields a support worthy of "The Iron City."

A pamphlet entitled "The True Issue for the True Churchman," by Drs. Anthon and Smith, of New York, professing to be a "Statement of Facts," touching the proceedings of those Rev. gentlemen in relation to the ordination of the Rev. Arthur Carey, has recently made its appearance and is for sale in this city. The extensive circulation given to this pamphlet, and the unfavorable impressions it is calculated to produce, and probably has already produced on the minds of some, as to the soundness in faith, not only of the Rev. Mr. Carey, but also of the Bishop who ordained him, the clergymen who recommended his ordination, and the Protestant Episcopal Church generally, require that, if possible, equal publicity should be given to the reply of the editor of "the Churchman" to that pamphlet, with his remarks on the proceedings at the ordination, which constitute the alleged reason for the publication of the pamphlet. As there are only three or four copies of this able and valuable periodical—the Churchman—taken in this city, (which is much to be regretted, and which, it is trusted, will soon be rectified,) it has been thought necessary and expedient, in order to afford the speediest remedy for the injury done, and likely to be done, by the "Pamphlet" of the two protesting clergymen, to publish the replies to the same in the present form.

This unexpected and unprecedented procedure at the ordination referred to, and the numerous publications which it has called forth, are denominated, by those whose "wish, perhaps, is father to their thought," a "controversy," or the "beginning of a controversy," in the Protestant Episcopal Church; and the note of alarm is sounded far and wide, as if the whole Church in these United States was to be affected by this outbreak in a solitary diocese. Not so. In the existing organization of the Church—if the case was as bad as Drs. Smith and Anthon have endeavored to represent it, and which the subjoined remarks of the editor of the Churchman will, to every candid and reflecting mind, prove to have been a *misrepresentation*—the difficulty must, of necessity, be limited to the diocese in which it occurred. Every bishop is independent in his own diocese, except so far as he is amenable to the laws and regulations of that diocese. And in cases of ordination, he acts strictly—though ordinarily governed, to a certain extent, by canonical enactments—*in foro conscientiæ*. He is not obliged to ordain any candidate who is *canonically* recommended to him, if in his conscience he believes him to be, for any cause, unfit or unworthy "to minister in holy things to the honor of God and the edification of the Church." And so, also, if he conscientiously believes, after sufficient inquiry and examination, that a candidate *is* fit and worthy, he has the power, *ex officio*, to ordain him, notwithstanding the protest, or it may be the pertinacious protest, of one or more presbyters. The responsibility is his, and his alone. He shares it with no one. And if he has, in the act, done any thing contrary or injurious to the *fundamental faith* of the Church, he is amenable to the Convention of his own diocese, and to that body alone. It cannot be made—as the editors of the Episcopal Recorder, in their very extraordinary appeal to the laity, in a recent paper, express the opinion that it will be made—matter for the action of the General Convention of the Church in the United States, for the very sufficient reason, that the General Convention has nothing to do with such matters. Its organization is *peculiar*, and its jurisdiction *limited*. It exercises *legislative* and *advisory* powers, but not *judicial*. *Discipline*, therefore, comes not within its province. And the case under consideration is strictly and exclusively a case of *discipline*, confined to the Bishop and the Diocese of New York. The idea, therefore, of any *lasting* controversy in the Church, issuing out of this *emeute*, and threatening or producing division of the Church, is preposterous to every well-informed Churchman.

AN EPISCOPALIAN.

Pittsburgh, Aug. 4, 1843.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

"An Old Subscriber," "Firm," and "Neither Peter nor Jack," are received.

We have been obliged to defer "Minimus," "T. R." "W. H. L.," and "Northern New York."

"G." is in type.

MARRIED,

On the 15th inst., in Trinity Church, Bristol, Conn., by the Rev. J. S. Covell, the Rev. John H. Hanson, son of the late John Savery Hanson, Esq., of St. Ann's, in the Island of Jamaica, W. I., to Miss Caroline Amelia Rich, of Bristol, Conn.

DIED,

At his residence in Mamaroneck, August 10, Lloyd S. Daubeny, Esq., late Senior Warden of Trinity Church, New Rochelle.

Mr. Daubeny was eminently a man of system and principle, and not to be appreciated or understood by every-day men of the world, who act from impulse or policy. He was calculated to make, and did make, a most consistent and steadfast Churchman; and rejoiced in nothing more than in the harmonious and tranquillizing services of the sanctuary. His highest *privilege*, (that was the emphatic word which his gratitude and humility led him always to prefer,) was "to behold the fair beauty of the Lord, and to visit His Temple." And he who thus honored his Maker was signally honored by Him, in the last years of his life; which were little less than years of protracted suffering. He had to contend against a natural temperament, which renders confinement and restraint extremely irksome, yet grace gave him the victory over all his infirmities, and he manifested the habitual meekness and pliancy of a little child, and ever spoke, not of his present chastisements, but of his past mercies. Rarely has the writer of this notice seen a more impressive spectacle, than that exhibited in him, of serene and uncomplaining resignation; and most cheerful is the hope with which he follows his departed friend to the world of spirits. "There remaineth therefore A REST to the people of God." That rest (to a sufferer like him a most precious welcome) is now his forevermore.

On the 28th ult., in Burlington, N. J., Frances Ford, second daughter of the Rev. R. I. Germain, aged 3 years and eleven months.

CALENDAR.

AUGUST.

20. Tenth Sunday after Trinity.
24. St. Bartholomew the Apostle.
27. Eleventh Sunday after Trinity.

SEPTEMBER.

3. Twelfth Sunday after Trinity.
10. Thirteenth Sunday after Trinity.
17. Fourteenth Sunday after Trinity.
20. Ember Day.
21. St. Matthew the Apostle.
22. } Ember Days.
23. }
24. Fifteenth Sunday after Trinity.
29. St. Michael and All Angels.

DIOCESAN RECORD.

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S APPOINTMENTS FOR VISITATION.

Tenth Sunday after Trinity, August 20, Norfolk, *St. Lawrence County.* Saturday, 26, A. M. Redhook, *Dutchess County*; 4 P. M. Clermont, *Columbia County.*

Eleventh Sunday after Trinity, August 27, Ulster, *Ulster County.* Tuesday, 29, Hyde Park, *Dutchess County.* 30, Esopus, *Ulster County.* 31, St. Paul's Church, Poughkeepsie, *Dutchess County.* September 1, Wappinger's Creek. 2, Marlborough, *Ulster County.*

Twelfth Sunday after Trinity, September 3, A. M. Fishkill Landing, *Dutchess County.* 4 P. M., Newburgh, *Orange County.* Tuesday, 5, Monticello, *Sullivan County.* Thursday, 7, Walden, *Orange County*, Ordination A. M., Confirmation P. M. 8, Goshen.

Thirteenth Sunday after Trinity, September 10, Fishkill, *Dutchess County.* 12, Paterson, *Putnam County*, Ordination A. M., Confirmation P. M. Thursday, 14, Milesquare, *Westchester County*, Consecration A. M., Confirmation P. M. 15, Pelham, Consecration A. M., Confirmation P. M.

Fourteenth Sunday after Trinity, September 17, Flatbush, *Kings county.*

Sixteenth Sunday after Trinity, October 1, St. Mary's Church, *New York.*

Tuesday, October 10, Greenburgh, *Westchester County.* 11, Tarrytown. 12, Sing Sing. Saturday, 14, Peekskill.

Eighteenth Sunday after Trinity, October 15, A. M. Phillipstown, *Putnam County*; 3 P. M. Cold Spring.

Where ordinations or institutions are to take place, the candidates are expected to see that at least two Presbyters, are in attendance.

The neighboring clergy are expected to make arrangements for officiating occasionally, prior to the Bishop's visitation, and preparing candidates for confirmation, if there be any, in such of the above named parishes as are vacant.

Any other services, not inconsistent with punctually meeting the above appointments, will also be rendered with pleasure during the same period

NOTICE.

YOUNG MEN'S CHURCH MISS'Y SOCIETY.

A regular monthly meeting of the Board of Managers of this Society will be held in the Sunday school room of St. Bartholomew's Church, on Monday evening next, the 21st inst., at 7½ o'clock.

GEORGE H. BELL,
New York, August 19, 1843. Recording Sec'y.

SECOND FRENCH CONGREGATION.

Divine worship in French, every Lord's Day, at 10½ A. M., and 7½ P. M., in the Chapel situated at the corner of Nassau street and Park Row. Sunday school at 9 A. M., and singing school for children at 3 P. M. Our American friends are respectfully requested to make this known to their French acquaintances.

C. H. WILLIAMSON,
August 19, 1843. 35 Murray street.

☞ The Trust Funds received by the Treasurer of the Domestic Committee will in future be acknowledged only in the Spirit of Missions.

139 Broadway, August 19, 1843.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

DOMESTIC MISSIONS.

The Treasurer of the Committee for Domestic Missions, since his report of the 9th of August, has received the following contributions:

Through D Ravenel, Esq, R A in Charleston, offerings of Prince George, Winyaw, per Rev Mr Laner, $6; Charleston Monthly Missionary Lecture, per Rev Mr Dupont, for Domestic Missions generally, $8 49; missions in the West, $1; Key West, $5; monthly collections in St Paul's ch, Pendleton, S C, per Rev Mr Potter, $37; offerings of St Michael's ch, Charleston, Rev Mr Keith, $67 14; Mrs K of the same ch, $15; Sunday school children of the same, $13 75; Bishop Gadsden, three month's contribution of St Philip's ch, Charleston, $90; ch in St Bartholomew's, per Rev Mr Fowles, for Clarksville, Ga, $11. Total, $254 38.

THOMAS N. STANFORD, Treasurer,
At the store of Swords, Stanford & Co,
August 16, 1843. 139 Broadway, New York.

N. Y. P. E. SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING RELIGION AND LEARNING IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

The Treasurer acknowledges the receipt of the following sums, being contributions to the Education Fund of the Diocese:

From St George's ch, Hempstead, Rev Dr Carmichael, $3. St James' church, New York, Rev John Dowdney, $2 05. Church of the Messiah, Glens Falls, $2 25. St Mark's ch, Williamsburgh, Rev S M Haskins, $2 75. Zion ch, Little Neck, L I, Rev H M Beare, $4. St Paul's ch, Tompkinsville, Rev W Wilton, $15 69. Total amount, $29 74.

JAMES F. DE PEYSTER,
New York, August 17, 1843. Treasurer.

FOREIGN MISSIONS.

The Treasurer of the Foreign Committee acknowledges the receipt of the following sums, since last report, July 26th:

From a friend to China, for Rev Dr Boone, $2; Zion ch, Wappinger's Creek, Rev G B Andrews, rector, $7; ladies' missionary society of Trinity ch, Columbus, O, Rev A F Dobb, rector, $17; through Mrs Bedell, for the "Bread Fund," Athens, to be distributed by Mrs Hill, in part, $85; a member of St Paul's ch, Phil, for annual support of Richard Newton, at Dr Savage's school, Africa, $20; Mrs B H Latrobe, for Africa, $2; Rev Robt Prout, rector of St Paul's ch, Calvert co, Maryland, $17 50; Zion ch, St Andrew's parish, Jefferson co, Va, for Africa, $5; do, from Jane H Keys, treas, sent in April, half, $9; Through E Wilcox, Esq, R A, Phil, Rev Dr May, and the rector and Sunday school teachers and scholars of St Stephen's ch, Wilkesbarre, Pa, 2d annual payment for the education of a Greek girl in the family of Mrs Hill, Athens, $40; St Stephen's ch, Wilkesbarre, for Africa, $7 50; do, do, proceeds of a gold chain, received in Quinquagesima collection, half, $2 12; through W H Hubbard, R A, Richmond, Va, a friend in Amherst co, Va, by Rev D Cadwell, $5; Leeds parish, Farquier co, by Rev G Lemmon, E N, half, $1 75; remnant of Christmas collection, half, $15 75—$17 50; Trinity ch, Staunton, Va, monthly collection, by Rev F Goodwin, half, $3; a lady of St George's ch, New York, $3; Christ ch Louisville, Ky, per Rev F C Pitkin, for Constantinople, $50; Horace Binney, jr, Esq, of Phil, for Constantinople, $25; through B Howard, Esq, R A, Boston, St Paul's ch, Boston, Rev Dr Vinton, rector, missionary association, $134 60; St Peter's Evangelical Society, Salem, Mass, Rev Mr Mason, rector, $40; Rev J J Robertson, D D, for Constantinople, $25; St Philip's ch, Charleston, S C, Rt Rev Bishop Gadsden, rector, collections June and July, viz., for Texas, $28; for Africa, $25—$53; by the hands of Rev J D Carder, rector of St John's ch, Fort Hamilton, N Y, from M M Z, $10; a friend to Episcopal missions, part, $4; St Paul's ch, Haymarket, Va, per Rt Rev Bishop Johns, for the Cavally station, Africa, $10. Total amount, $590 22.

F. S. WINSTON,
New York, August 16, 1843. Acting Treasurer.

WANTED to hire, a large PEW in St. Paul's or St. John's Chapels. Apply at No. 5 Nassau street, second floor.

For sale, a PEW in the middle aisle of St. George's Church. Apply at No. 5 Nassau street, second floor.

August 19—3t

BISHOP CHASE'S REMINISCENCES.

NUMBERS Five and Six of Bishop Chase's Reminiscences have been published and are for sale by the Bishop's Agent, Alexander V. Blake, 77 Fulton street, New York. Subscribers and others are requested to call for them.

P. S. The different Periodicals of the Protestant Episcopal Church are requested to give the above notice. August 16, 1843.

PRIVATE SCHOOL FOR BOYS,

UNDER THE CARE OF THE REV. C. D. JACKSON, A. M.,
255 *Greene street, near Waverly Place.*

THE Fall Term will commence on Monday, September 4th. The design of this School is to give to *a very small number* the means of a thorough and accomplished education preparatory to college or business, *under the personal instruction of the Principal.* Circulars containing terms, references, &c., can be had at the house.

August 19—1m.

WASHINGTON COLLEGE.

THE Fall Term of this Institution will commence on Thursday, the 21st day of September next, at which time students who propose to enter at the beginning of the collegiate year, should present themselves for examination. The requisites for admission are the same as in the other colleges of New England

Washington College was founded under the auspices of Bishop Brownell, and chartered by the Legislature of Connecticut in 1824. The first class was graduated in 1827. It now numbers 247 alumni, 80 of whom are clergymen, and between 20 and 30 now candidates for orders. It is strictly a Church Institution; the members of the Faculty and of the Board of Trustees being all Churchmen. The course of study is as extensive and as thorough as in any of the northern colleges. It has a well selected library, and a chemical and philosophical apparatus, amply sufficient for all the purposes of instruction. There are three terms in the year.

The expenses are—for tuition, $11 per term; room rent, $3 50; servants' hire, use of library, &c., $3; board, from $1 50 to $2 25 per week.

The whole expense of a student during term time, exclusive of clothing, need not exceed $175 per annum. With strict economy, a less sum will suffice.

Washington College, Aug. 19, 1843 6t

PALMER'S TREATISE ON THE CHURCH.

Recently published by
D. APPLETON & CO.,
200 Broadway, New York,

A Treatise on the Church of Christ; Designed chiefly for the use of Students in Theology. By the Rev. William Palmer, M. A. Edited with Notes, by the Rt. Rev. W. R. Whittingham, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese of Maryland. 2 vols. 8vo., handsomely printed, $5.

"This able, elaborate and learned vindication of the claims of the Protestant Episcopal Church to be considered the True Catholic Church, and the exposure which is here made of the grounds of difference between it and the Romish Church, and of the baseless pretensions of that Church to be the 'one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church," will assuredly commend these volumes to the favor of Churchmen.—*N. Y. American.*

"To our clergy and intelligent laity who desire to see the Church justly discriminated from Romanists on the one hand and dissenting denominations on the other, we earnestly commend Palmer's Treatise on the Church."—*Churchman.*

D. A. & Co. have also just published,

Parochial Sermons, by John Henry Newman, B. D., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. The six volumes of London edition, printed in two handsome octavo volumes of upwards of 600 pages each. $5.

⁂ The Sermons of Mr. Newman are pronounced by several of our bishops and clergy, to be superior to all others of modern times.

The Kingdom of Christ; or Hints respecting the Principles, Constitution, and Ordinances of the Catholic Church. By Frederick Denison Maurice, M. A., Chaplain of Guy's Hospital, Professor of English Literature and History, King's College, London. In one elegant octavo volume of 500 pages, uniform in style with Newman's Sermons, Palmer on the Church, &c. $2 50.

The History of the Reformation of the Church of England. By Gilbert Burnet, D. D., late Lord Bishop of Salisbury. With the Collection of Records, and a copious Index, revised and corrected, with additional Notes and a Preface, by the Rev. E. Nares, D. D. Illustrated with a Frontispiece and twenty-three elegantly engraved Portraits, forming four elegant 8vo. vols. $8.

(*List to be continued.*)

Books imported to order, by every steamer, in single copies or quantities, as may be desired, on the best terms. August 19—2tis

IN PRESS.

D. APPLETON & CO. are preparing for publication: The Gospel Narrative of the Holy Week, harmonized with reflections. By the Rev. Isaac Williams, B. D., late Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford. 1 vol. 16mo.

The Gospel Narrative of our Lord's Passion, harmonized with reflections. By the Rev. Isaac Williams, B. D. 1 vol. 16mo.

The Double Witness of the Church. By the Rev. W. Ingraham Kip, author of "Lenten Fast." 1 vol. 16mo of 350 pages.

The Unity of the Church. By the Rev. Henry E. Manning, M. A. 1 vol. 16mo.

The Churchman's Companion in the Closet; or, a Complete Manual of Private Devotions. Collected from the writings of Archbishop Laud, Bishop Andrewes, Bishop Ken, Dr. Hickes, Mr. Kettlewell, Mr. Spinckes, and other eminent Old English Divines. With a Preface by Rev. Mr. Spinckes. Edited by Francis E. Paget, M. A. 1 vol. 16mo.

Of the Imitation of Christ. Four Books, by Thomas a Kempis. First complete American edition. 1 vol. 16mo.

Disce Vivere—Learn to Live. Wherein is shown that the Life of Christ is and ought to be an express Pattern for Imitation unto the Life of a Christian. By Christopher Sutton, D. D., author of Disce Mori—Learn to Die, Meditations on the Sacrament, &c.—one elegant volume, 16mo. August 16.

TRINITY CHURCH CEMETERY, AT MANHATTANVILLE.

THIS Cemetery is now ready for interments in graves or in vaults. It contains twenty-four acres of land, running from the Tenth Avenue to the Hudson River, and between 153d and 155th streets. The soil is of the best quality for the purpose, and to those who have not seen it, it may be necessary to say that the beauties of the place, and its rural and picturesque scenery, cannot be surpassed. The Tenth Avenue in front of the grounds has been opened, and a dock has been built on the river at the foot of 155th street. That portion of the grounds fronting the Tenth Avenue is intended for more immediate use for graves, vaults, and family burial places; but places for vaults can also be had, (if preferred,) in that portion nearest the river, which is covered with a fine open wood, and parts of it about 170 feet above high water descending gradually to the river.

Applications for interments should be made as early as convenient to Mr. Morison, Sexton, at the Vestry Office, corner of Fulton and Church streets. The prices for graves and for vaults and family burial grounds have been fixed at the lowest rate. For further information, and for the charges attending interments, apply to Mr. Morison as above.

August 12—tf.

JUST PUBLISHED,
REV. DR. JARVIS'S SERMONS.

TWO Sermons, by the Rev. Dr. Jarvis:—The first on Prophecy in general, the second in reference to the Doctrine of the Second Advent.

In pursuing this subject, Dr. Jarvis has been led to compile several original chronological tables, derived chiefly from sources not generally accessible, and throwing new light on some of the difficulties of scriptural chronology, the publication of which will form a valuable contribution to ecclesiastical literature.

J. A. SPARKS,
Churchman Bookstore, 109 Nassau-street.
July 15.

From the London Morning Post.

PUSEYISM IN LONDON.

LETTER I.

My dear friend,—I take up my pen in order to fulfil my promise of informing you what I have observed since my arrival in this great metropolis, as regards the progress of opinion in religious matters. You must not expect a formal dissertation, but only such loose observations as I may find time to set down. Possibly, however, they may give you a better notion of the state of things than an elaborate treatise.

Amongst the various objects of public excitement, the critical state of Ireland, the disruption of the Presbyterian Establishment in Scotland, and the Corn Law question in England—each of which, in ordinary times, would be sufficient to absorb the public attention—the ferment and excitement with regard to Church matters seem to increase rather than diminish. What I have been exceedingly struck with is, the extreme bitterness and almost incredible ignorance with which Church principles are assailed, under the cant vulgar name of Puseyism; and, at the same time, the sure and silent progress that the Church and Church principles are making.

One of the first things which attracted my notice was a large placard, to the effect that the "Young men of London must hasten and sign a petition against Sir James Graham's Factory Bill, if they wished to save the country from Popery and *Puseyism !*" Why, anything more contrary to Puseyism—anything more nearly approaching the confines of Latitudinarianism, than the educational clauses in Sir James Graham's Factory Bill, it is difficult to conceive. A number of schools are to be set up, in which the master is not to be allowed even to explain to the children the doctrines contained in the Bible, lest, indirectly, he should be the means of making proselytes; but because the Church is just recognized as the established religion, though the power to disseminate her doctrine is taken from her, the Dissenters are up in arms against the Bill, and declare that it is for the propagation of Puseyism.

I only mention this as an instance of the excessive ignorance, or wilful misrepresentation, which prevails, when a Bill is branded with the name of Puseyism, with which it has not the remotest affinity—a Bill in which Dr. Pusey and his friends, probably, interest themselves less than any other class of men in her Majesty's dominions; and rightly so, because it is a Latitudinarian half-measure, which will do little or no good to any one. If the Bill is carried, the Church must do its duty, and make the best of it. If it is abandoned, one good result will arise from it, that everybody will see that the Dissenters are the only cause why the people remain uneducated. Another remarkable circumstance is, that Church principles and Puseyism are beginning to be generally spoken of, at least amongst the Dissenters, as synonymous; and, indeed, mainly they are so. It is the legitimate authority of the Church which these crafty schismatics are attacking under the name of Puseyism.

A large portion of the outcry against Puseyism arises from the jealousy of the leading evangelical clergy, the spouters at Exeter Hall, the committee-men of certain societies who have long been accustomed to act in defiance of Church or bishop. I do not say that many among the evangelical clergy are not honest and conscientious opponents of these doctrines, as being contrary to what they suppose Gospel truth—that is, the limited and partial views which they themselves have adopted; but the factious outcry proceeds from the leaders amongst them, who cannot bear to have their popularity diminished, and their favorite modes of proceeding called in question. It is incredible with what perseverance these persons have labored to excite the minds of the middle classes against what they term Puseyism. Most fearfully will they have to answer before God for the unchristian bitterness and enmity which they, in conjunction with certain newspaper writers, their allies, have contrived to instil into the minds of the weaker and more ill-educated portion of their flocks.

The ignorant animosity which has been worked up by these means amongst the middle and lower classes, would really be most laughable, if it were not rather shocking. I was assailed yesterday on the subject by an old lady, who sat opposite to me in an omnibus. Pray do not think that I encourage polemical discussions in an omnibus; but really, from this pertinacious old lady I had no means of escape, except by getting out into the rain.

"So, sir, I hear that Dr. Pusey has at last publicly declared himself a Catholic; I am glad of it, sir."

I assured her, that if she meant that he had become a *Roman* Catholic, she must be under some mistake; for Dr. Pusey was too good a man to separate himself from his own Church.

"I'd give a hundred pounds if it were true," said the old lady, her eyes glistening with malignity; "I hate those Puseyites. Why, sir, if my own son was in the Church and took up these new-fangled notions, *I would not go to hear him.*" The old lady was working herself up into a climax of wrath; not to go and *hear* a person was, according to her way of thinking, one of the greatest punishments she could inflict. "To think," she continued, "that we should be now going back to beggarly elements, after we have lived so long with the light of the Gospel shining around us!"

"Do you really consider, ma'am," I interposed, "that the days are so enlightened, and Gospel truth so universally diffused, that we require no improvement? Look at these wretched streets through which we are passing, see the miserable objects reeling from that gin-palace—are these signs of any great diffusion of Gospel light?"

I did not choose to prolong the conversation, or I might have said a great deal more. If the Evangelicals in and out of the Church could amend this state of things, why have they not done it? They have had a fair trial, and ample opportunity. If, as it is obvious, they are altogether incompetent to the task, why not second the attempts made by the Puseyites, (if they choose to call them so,) or, more properly, the sound members of the Church, who are so zealously exerting themselves in the good work? My own opinion is, that the Church has yet the power to save the nation, if her efforts be not thwarted by ignorance and malevolence.

Another class of persons who are sadly irritated by the progress of Puseyism are the low, calculating Utilitarians, the mere nineteenth century men. The Edinburgh Reviewer states, with the greatest gravity and simplicity, that he has no ideas or principles in common with the Puseyites. I entirely believe him. Mr. Joseph Hume declared, in Parliament, that they ought to be *put down*. "He was sorry to say that these pernicious doctrines and mummeries were finding their way into Bills on the table of that House. Clauses had been introduced into the Factory Bill to prevent children being taught on fasts and festivals. He trusted the Right Hon. Baronet would take such measures as would effectually put down the new schism." If the Right Hon. Baronet should adopt Mr. Hume's advice, I apprehend that he will find that he has undertaken a task somewhat beyond his power. Puseyism is not of a temper to heed the patronage of the great. Let us rather hope that he will have the grace to discern the true nature of the spirit which is abroad in the Church, and avail himself of it to save and regenerate the nation. However, the antipathy of such men as Mr. Hume and the Edinburgh Reviewer is instructive. If the Church would but so contrive as not to interfere with these worldlings and Latitudinarians, they can manage to endure her. But let her gird herself with her strength, and present a firm front against the low prejudices and sham enlightenment of the age—let her be the champion of high and holy truths, and inspire her sons with something of her own generous spirit; then these men of the age are surprised; they know not what to make of the new spirit which has arisen; it seems to them madness, folly, enthusiasm; they would laugh at it if they could, but it thwarts their schemes and notions; and so, while they gladly tolerate every form of error, every extravagance of Atheism and fanaticism, they cry out that *Puseyism must be put down.*

Besides the factious hostility of the Dissenters, Evangelicals, and Latitudinarians, there is a more honest prejudice against Puseyism amongst some of the lay members of the Established Church, arising from a sheer mistake, which, when it is removed, will, I expect, induce these well-meaning persons to maintain Church principles as warmly as they now decry them. These persons are mostly of Conservative politics, and are offended by any symptom of change, and fancy that the Church is assailed by the Puseyites; whereas all that the large body of those who are so termed desire, is to restore the Church of England to her right position.

In fact, not one man in a hundred of this class of laymen has the least conception what Puseyism is. Every one calls his neighbor a Puseyite if he is a stricter Churchman than himself. To attend the holy communion with regularity, to go to Church when there is no sermon, *only* to say our prayers to Almighty God, to observe the day of our Lord's ascension, or any of the festivals, or to attend the week day service—all these are sure symptoms of Puseyism. The more strictly a man conforms to the Church's ordinances, the more he is suspected of being a Puseyite, and one who secretly desires the Church's downfall. Let a man obey the bishop whom God has set over him, and he is suspected of being an enemy to the Church; let him disregard the bishop's injunction, and persist in neglecting the Church's written ordinance, and he is a sound Protestant Establishment man. Of this class poor Sir Peter Laurie, the "sad, silly, saddlemaker," who has recently taken to dabble in controversy, is an ultra specimen. With laughable inconsistency he harangues against schism, and publishes his attachment to the Church—where think you?—at the "Jewin street branch of the *Wesleyan* Missionary Meeting!" And he calls his bishop "a babbler and talker of nonsense," because he recommends to the clergy what is ordered in the Prayer-book. The poor gentleman is haunted by the bugbear of Puseyism.

Amongst educated persons the absurdity of this outcry is pretty well acknowledged; but the middle classes, the mercantile, and professional, not having before turned their attention to Church matters, and being, we may allow in the case of many of them, conscientiously attached to the Church even as it is, are at first suspicious of what appear to them innovations, but which are really in strict accordance with the Church's law. When these matters come to be more understood, we may feel sure that conscientious men of this description will give in their adherence to sound Church principles. They only now oppose them, because they do not know what Church principles really are.

What people are now taught to attack as Puseyism, namely, observance of festivals, obedience to bishops, strictness in following the Church, and, amongst doctrine, that of baptismal regeneration, and the real spiritual presence in the Holy Eucharist—all these things which are denounced are most undoubted doctrines and practices of our Church; and the more the subject is discussed, the more will this be acknowledged. Meanwhile, in spite of all this outcry, Church principles—or, if people will call them so, Puseyism—is making sure and silent progress, and promoting the best and holiest objects.

London, May, 1843.

From the British Critic.

CATHOLIC TRUTH ALONE FAVORABLE TO EVANGELICAL VIRTUE.

The complete *assemblage* of evangelical virtues never was, and never will be, realized except in connection with Catholic and sacramental doctrine. And, besides that the Christian character is made up not of many, but of *all* the requisite graces, so it is, that the combination of all holy tempers is an essential condition of the "perfect soundness" of each. Even a heathen moralist could see, that, where there is one perfect virtue, there will be all; and so, that where any is wanting, none will be perfect. In the same way, under the Gospel, the saints are ever not only pure, but humble; not only humble, but reverent; not only reverent, but kindly affectioned; "*add* faith to virtue, and virtue to knowledge, and knowledge to godliness," and so on through the whole circle of graces enumerated by the apostle. And all these graces run, as it were, like the prismatic colors, into one another, so that each seems to depend for its unequalled beauty upon its association with the others.

It is true, indeed, that they are *matured* one by one; still the saint is ever "pressing on" where he has not "already attained." It is far otherwise with those who disparage sacraments. Not merely are they, as a body, wanting in certain essential requisites of the Christian character, (this even a saint may be *for a time*,) but they *acquiesce* in their deficiency. Hence they are apt to be marked, from first to last, by some great and conspicuous failing. Either they are vain, or they are covetous, or they are uncharitable, or they are ambitious, or they are irritable, or they are lazy; and they go on, year after year, without exhibiting signs of improvement. We are speaking not directly of individuals, but of classes, whose faults or excellences are more immediately due to the system under which they have been trained. And we are entirely prepared to join issue with the advocates of the anti sacramental theory upon the question of results; and to maintain that, if Christianity consist not but in vigorous deeds, not in a religion of "fits and starts," but in a humble, conscientious, and consistent walk; not in certain "good points" or amiable traits, but in a certain diffusing of itself through all conduct; not in a graceful use of prosperity, but in the power of bearing up under difficulties; or, to sum up all, in a character which is armed at all points, and adequate to all emergencies, and this not now and then only, but on the whole, and in a long run; then must we contend that no doctrine is capable of producing such results, but that which was the fruitful source of Christian saintliness for fifteen centuries before the name of Protestantism was broached, or the notion contemplated, in the Church of Christ.

ON THE STABILITY OF THE CHURCH.

Extract from a Sermon by Dr. Potter.

Of real tendency to Romanism it may be safely affirmed that, within our Church, there is none. There is not a clergyman in our communion who would not regard the errors of that Church, her idolatrous worship of a human being, her invocation of saints, her mutilation of the sacrament, her sacrifice of masses, her doctrine of purgatory and of transubstantiation, her claim to infallibility, and her assertion of the Pope's supremacy, as interposing between her communion and ours an impassable gulf. Though well acquainted with the bishops, and a large proportion of the clergy of the Church in this country, and though not unacquainted with the condition of the established Church in England, I am unable to perceive that either communion is nearer to a union with the Church of Rome, unless she shall renounce her pretensions and her errors, than they were fifty years ago. The most powerful and convincing exposures of the corruptions of the Papal religion that the theological learning of the last hundred years has produced, are to be found in the writings of the very men who are charged with a design to bring in the errors of that system,[*] and I hazard nothing in affirming, that if the day shall ever come when it shall be necessary to go forth to battle against the armies of Rome, the most invincible champions of the truth will be found, not among the sects who are most vehement in their assaults upon the Papal Church, not among those who rely confidently upon unaided private judgment in matters of religion, but among those profound scholars and thinkers who are familiar with the nature and use of historic evidence. I pretend not to vouch for the entire soundness of the views of any set of theological writers who may have appeared in the English Church within the last few years. Like other mortal men, they probably have their weak side. They are to be ranked along with other private authors, for whose opinions, especially on subordinate points, the Church is in no degree responsible, and who must stand or fall by their own merits. Setting out, as they did, to oppose what they deemed to be the errors of one extreme, the extreme of impulse, irreverence, latitudinarianism, it would not be very strange if they should be found to have been carried, in some things, somewhat too far in the opposite extreme. Nor can it be deemed very surprising that among their readers here and there an individual of weak mind and superficial information should have rushed from one extreme to the other, from low views of the ministry and the sacraments to the Romish communion. These things, however, affect not the great body of the English and American Churches. They were never farther from Romanism, or from any danger of serious change, than at the present moment. For every single individual who has been weak enough and ignorant enough to embrace the errors of Rome, and a few such persons are to be found in every age and Church, we can point to hundreds who have renounced those errors and come in to kneel at our altars.

Our Church occupies, let it ever be remembered, a middle ground, in regard to its doctrines, discipline and worship, between Romanism on the one side and ultra Protestantism on the other, being very clearly and widely distinguished in its principles from both. Now if we advert to a single fundamental principle, which is peculiar to our system, we shall perceive, I think, that there is a security for the stability of our views of truth, which does not belong either to the Papacy on the one side, or to the various sects on the other, who have renounced all deference to the early Church, as a witness to "the faith once delivered to the saints." These sects all rely, for the correct interpretation of Scripture, upon their own unaided private judgment. They have no invariable standard of truth, since their private judgments may put different interpretations upon the same passages of Scripture at different times. They may be carried along insensibly by circumstances, by the current of an age, from one theological position to another. Such progress is the more easy too, inasmuch as they are destitute of liturgies, which always render change difficult. But their peculiar liability to change results from unaided private judgment being their only standard of doctrinal truth. We should suppose that they would lack stability; and we know from their brief history since the Reformation that such has been the case. All of them have been undergoing constant and great changes. Romanism on the other hand is certainly more fixed in its character than are these sects; nevertheless it also has entirely corrupted that great principle, which would have secured the correctness and the stability of its doctrinal views. Instead of relying on the private judgment of the individual, it places implicit reliance on its own infallibility as a Church, and that too irrespective of historic testimony. In virtue of this pretended infallibility it asserts its right and power to decree at any time new articles of faith, articles of faith which have no warrant in holy Scripture and no sanction in that Christianity which was nearest to the Apostles. Being thus destitute of an unalterable standard of truth, and holding, as that Church does, that it has power to add to the faith, that later decrees may even contradict the earlier,[†] there is nothing to prevent it from taking the errors, which may happen to prevail in any age permanently into its system, and thus advancing from one form of error to another. History proves that this is not mere theory. For several centuries previous to the Reformation and the Council of Trent the Papal religion was subjected to repeated additions and alterations.

Now the principle, which governed the Reformation in England, and which lies at the foundation of our Church, differs entirely from both these extremes. In the interpretation of Scripture for the purpose of obtaining the great articles of our faith, we trust, neither to the unaided private judgment of the individual, nor to any assumed infallibility of the Church, as a body, irrespective of historic evidence. The Preface to our ordination service declares, that "it is evident unto all men diligently reading holy Scripture and *ancient authors*,[‡] (that is, Christian writers of the first centuries,) that from the Apostles' time there have been these three orders of ministers in Christ's Church, bishops, priests, and deacons." It is Scripture then, not as interpreted by any man's private judgment, not as corrupted by a Church professing to be infallible and independent of antiquity, but Scripture as understood and universally received in the ages nearest to the Apostles, while the Church had as yet been kept pure by persecution, and when in fact there had not been time for any great and general changes of doctrine or discipline; it is Scripture thus interpreted and attested that we appeal to for evidence, that our faith and order were rightly settled at the Reformation, and that we have preserved them pure and unchanged ever since. It was by a "diligent reading of *holy Scripture and ancient authors*" that the Reformers were enabled to purify the English Church from the corruptions of Romanism, to preserve it from the excesses and disorders of ultra Protestantism, and restore it as nearly as possible to a conformity in great and essential matters to the primitive model.[§] This *primitive model*, then, i. e., the sense in which Scripture was universally received by that early Church, which had the best right to know what it meant, constitutes an unalterable standard, with which we may always compare ourselves. Unless the Church shall relapse into ignorance of the primitive truth, it will always suffice to keep us steady.[∥] It must forever prevent us from embracing the errors of Romanism; for the historic evidence to which we appeal shows, that there was a time when those errors did not exist; it reveals the several periods when they were, one after another, introduced into the Church. The same standard of truth will be equally effectual to restrain us (if we continue faithful to the principle) from running into the disorders, excesses and heresies of other sects, because it qualifies and regulates the exercise of private judgment, and discloses to us the time and manner in which their multiplied changes have been brought about. As the application of this principle brought the Church back to the truth at the Reformation, and has kept it steady, unalterable ever since, we may reasonably hope, that with the aid of our Liturgy, and the blessing of God, it will preserve us from open change, as well as from insensible corruption, hereafter.[¶]

---

[*] See the works of Palmer, Pusey, and Newman. I may also refer to several editorial articles which have recently appeared in the *N. Y. Churchman*, and which, for cogency, I suspect, will compare favorably with any productions that have been put forth against the Papal Church, in this country, within the same period.

[†] This may seem strong language, but it is fully warranted by facts. The Roman Church does indeed talk much of Tradition and the Fathers; but her tradition is a corrupt one, never reaching up to the first three centuries, and the fathers to whom she is fond of appealing are not the earlier, but the later. When the elder Fathers have stood in her way, her authorities have alleged that they contained errors; and they have even presumed to put forth editions of their writings in which certain passages calculated to "infect the minds of the faithful with heretical pravity, or turn them aside from the Catholic (Romish) and orthodox faith," have been corrected or suppressed! The infallibility of the existing Church is the grand dogma of Rome, and belief in it appears in all that she says and does. Thus the Council of Constance decrees "that although in the primitive Church the sacrament was received by the faithful under both kinds, yet for the avoiding of some dangers and scandals, this custom has been reasonably introduced, that it be received by the consecrating persons under both kinds and by the laity only under one kind; since it is to be most firmly believed and in no wise to be doubted, that the entire Body and Blood of Christ is truly contained as well under the bread as under the wine." Cardinal Cusa justifies this decree, declaring that "if the Church do expound any evangelical sense contrary to what the current sense and practice of the Catholic Primitive Church did, not that but this present interpretation must be taken for the way of salvation, for God changes His judgment as the Church does!" Those who wish to see more on this subject may consult Bishop Taylor on the "Power fasely pretended to by the Church of Rome," and the authorities referred to by him. Works, v. 10, p. 485.

[‡] Let it be particularly observed that the English Reformers formerly, and Churchmen now, appeal to the earliest Fathers, not in unquestioning reliance on their *judgments* as individuals, but in order to show from their testimony, from a comparison of all their writings, what was the universal faith and practice of the Church every where in the ages next to the Apostles. They are appealed to as *witnesses*, not as *judges*.

[§] The English reformers disclaimed the idea of trusting to their own private fancies, when engaged in the work of purifying and restoring the Church; and in their controversies with the partisans of Rome they challenged them to produce one plain passage from the primitive doctors, in favor of transubstantiation or of purgatory, or of any other of their distinctive doctrines—a challenge which was not and could not be answered.

[∥] The fact that in the middle ages, when the early Fathers were generally unknown, or inaccessible, an usurping Church should have corrupted her doctrine and worship, cannot be deemed surprising, nor in any way inconsistent with the argument.

[¶] Mr. Newman concludes a chapter "on Romanism as neglectful of antiquity," with the following passages found since the sermon was written: "I am led to this remark, because apprehensions have been felt, I would say causelessly, lest those who admit the existence of this primitive rule, or rather usage, were thereby making some dangerous concession to the Romanists; which it cannot be, if, as the latter avow, the Fathers not merely fail to mention, but actually contradict the Roman peculiarities."

"I make one remark more. Enough has been said to show the hopefulness of our own prospects in the controversy with Rome. We have her own avowal that the Fathers ought to be followed, and again that she does not follow them; what more can we require than her witness against herself which is here supplied us? If such inconsistency is not at once fatal to her claims, which it would seem to be, at least it is a most encouraging omen in our contest with her. We have but to remain pertinaciously and immoveably fixed on the ground of antiquity; and as truth is ours, so will the victory be also. We have joined issue with her, and that in a point which admits of decision—of a decision, as she confesses, against herself. Abstract arguments, original views, novel interpretations of Scripture, may be met by similar artifices on the other side; but historical facts are proof against the force of talent, and remain where they were when it has expended itself. How mere Protestants, (meaning ultra Protestants who reject any aid from antiquity in the interpretation of Scripture,) who rest upon no such solid foundation, are to withstand our common adversary, is not so clear, and not our concern. We would fain make them partakers of our vantage ground; but since they despise it, they must take care of themselves, and must not complain if we refuse to desert a position which promises to be impregnable—impregnable both as against Romanists and against themselves.—*Newman on Romanism and Popular Protestantism*, p. 100.

From the Englishman's Magazine

ON CHRIST'S PRESENCE IN THE SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

It is very evident that there is in these days much ignorance respecting Christian doctrines; and perhaps none is more misunderstood than that of the sacraments. A loose, semi-Socinian notion prevails very generally, not only among sectaries, but, it is to be feared, is entertained by too many of the members of the Church. The Lord's Supper is either considered to hold the same position, as a means of grace, as preaching; or, if allowed to be superior in efficacy, to be so only on account of its affording a more lively representation of that which it sets forth; and consequently being more affecting to the mind and feelings, it is held to be a more solemn ordinance than the other parts of divine worship—and that seems all. While those who contend that it is something more—that there is, as the Church teaches, a real spiritual presence of Christ in the eucharist, "the more real that it is spiritual;" that in it he is more peculiarly communicated to faithful recipients,—are accused of Romanising, and charged with holding, implicitly if not explicitly, the comparatively modern dogma of transubstantiation. For the benefit, however, of those who cannot hear of the "real spiritual presence" without reverting to transubstantiation, and (to their great grief and just indignation) charging those who maintain this sound Church doctrine with Popery,—we shall here produce the opinions of men who cannot possibly be accused of holding the popish doctrine of the eucharist, since they went to the stake in consequence of their refusal to acknowledge it. The following extracts from the confession of Cranmer, Latimer, and Ridley, when arraigned at Oxford, before a commission appointed to inquire into their heresies, we give without note or comment—for they require none; simply remarking, that few modern advocates of the "real presence," suspected as they are of Romanising in this article of the Lord's Supper, would express themselves more strongly:

"His true body is truly present" (in the eucharist) "to them that truly receive him; but spiritually" "I say and agree with the Church, that the body of Christ is in the sacrament effectually, because the passion of Christ is effectual." (Cranmer.)

Ridley, after making a confession of his faith on this subject in the words of many of the fathers, from Cyprian to Bertram, (who wrote in the ninth century against Radbertus, who asserted the *carnal* presence of Christ in the eucharist,) says, "But of these it may clearly appear unto all men how far we are from that opinion, whereof some go about falsely to slander us to the world, saying, we teach that the godly and faithful should receive nothing else at the Lord's table but a figure of the body of Christ." "To the right celebration of the Lord's Supper, there is no other presence of Christ required than a spiritual presence; and this presence is sufficient for Christian men as a presence by which we abide in Christ, and Christ abideth in us, to the obtaining of eternal life, if we persevere. And this same presence may be called most fitly a real presence; that is, a presence not feigned, but a true and faithful presence; which thing I here rehearse, lest some sycophant or scorner should suppose me, with the anabaptists, to make nothing else of the sacrament but a naked and bare sign." "I affirming in that sacrament to be truly and verily the body and blood of Christ, effectuously by grace and spirit." (Sermon at Paul's Cross, referred to, during his examination.) "For if you take *really* for *verè*, for spiritually by grace and efficacy, then it is true that the natural body and blood of Christ is in the sacrament, *verè et realiter*, in deed and really." (Examination in 1555.) "Both you (Bishop of Lincoln, one of the commission) and I agree herein, that in the sacrament is the true and natural body of Christ, even that which was born of the Virgin Mary; only we differ *in modo*, in the way and manner of being. I confess Christ's natural body to be in the sacrament indeed by spirit and grace: because that whosoever receiveth worthily that bread and wine, receiveth effectually Christ's body and drinketh his blood; that is, he is made effectual partaker of his passion." "In the sacrament is a certain change, in that bread, which was before common bread, is now made a lively representation of Christ's body; and not only a figure, but effectuously representeth his body; that even as the mortal body was nourished by that visible bread, so is the internal soul fed with the heavenly food of Christ's body. Such a sacramental mutation I grant to be in the bread and wine: which truly is no small change: but such as no mortal man can make, but only that omnipotency of Christ's word."

Hear Latimer:—"In the sacrament by spirit and grace is the very body and blood of Christ; because that every man by receiving bodily that bread and wine, spiritually receiveth the body and blood of Christ, and is made partaker thereby of the merits of Christ's passion." "The holy office which the bread beareth, that is, to be a figure of Christ's body; and not only a true figure, but effectually to represent the same." "In the sacrament the worthy receiver receiveth the very body of Christ, and drinketh his blood by spirit and grace." And with these, does not the doctrine of our Church agree? "Then" (in the Lord's Supper) "we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood." "The body and blood of Christ, which are *verily* and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." "Sacraments are *effectual* signs of grace." "To such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ, and the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ."

PRIVATE TUITION.

A PRESBYTER of the Church in the United States, and M. A. of Columbia College, N.Y., havin just returned from Europe, is desirous of a few pupils. either Young Gentlemen or Ladies, to instruct in the Classics or English Literature, either at his own house or at the residences of his pupils.

Address No. 50 Franklin-street.

REFERENCES.

Right Rev. Bishop Benjamin T. Onderdonk.
" " " Whittingham.
" " " Eastburn.

Rev. Dr. Berrian.	Prof. Chas. Anthon, LL. D.
" " Taylor.	Dr. John Stearns.
" " Anthon.	Curtis Bolton, Esq.
" " Smith.	Louis Loutrel, Esq.
" " M'Vickar.	Thomas C. Butler, Esq.
" " Turner.	George T. Strong, Esq.
" " Wilson.	
" J. M. Forbes.	
" B. I. Haight.	July 8—2m

ORGAN MANUFACTORY.

ANTHONY-STREET, NEW YORK.

THE subscriber manufactures all kinds and sizes of Church and Parlor Organs, of improved construction, superiority of tone, and at extremely moderate and advantageous terms.

Also, those truly useful organs; possessing Barrel action in addition to the usual finger keys; by which Psalmody is performed in the first style of execution, and rendering this noble instrument perfectly available in Country Churches where Organists cannot be procured.

FOR SALE,

Several Parlor Organs, varying from $200 upwards.

Also, Church Organs, of great volume of tone, from $300 upwards.

Also, a large Church Organ, with two sets of keys fourteen Stops, Pedals, Swell, Choir Bass, &c., in elegant white case, of classical design—10 feet wide, 15 feet high.

GEORGE JARDINE,
May 27—yly Organ Builder.

BISHOP HOPKINS' SECOND LETTER TO BISHOP KENRICK.

Second edition, with a Postscript.

BISHOP HOPKINS on the Prediction of the Second Advent in 1843.

The Church of Rome in her Primitive Purity, Compared with the Church of Rome at the Present Day. By the Rt. Rev. J. H. HOPKINS, D. D.

The Primitive Church Compared with the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Present Day. By the same author.

Essay on Gothic Architecture, with various Plans and Drawings for Churches; Designed Chiefly for the use of the Clergy.

For sale at the Church Depository,
July 29. No. 20 John street.

JUST PUBLISHED,

NO. VIII. OF THE

ILLUSTRATED BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER,

EDITED BY REV. J. M. WAINWRIGHT, D. D.

THIS splendid work is beautifully printed on paper of the finest quality, and will be embellished with upward of seven hundred superior engravings on wood, principally from the old masters, and will, when complete, form the most magnificent volume ever issued from the American press. Among the illustrations of the present number are, engravings from pictures by *Rembrandt, Paul Veronese F. Verdier, Sir Joshua Reynolds, Bird, &c.*

To be completed in twenty numbers. Published semi-monthly, by

H. W. HEWET. 281 Broadway,
July 29. Price 31¼ cents.

BROOKLYN COLLEGIATE INSTITUTE,

An English and Classical Boarding School,

WASHINGTON AVENUE, BROOKLYN.

THE Rev. JACOB W. DILLER having accepted a call to the rectorship of St. Luke's Church, on Clinton Avenue has associated himself with Mr. Young in the discharge of the various duties of this institution.—Mr. Diller was for many years associated with the Rev. Dr. Muhlenburg in his celebrated institution at Flushing, in which he established a reputation as a highly talented and successful teacher. To persons consulting the health and happiness, the literary, moral and religious improvement of their sons or wards, this school offers inducements excelled perhaps by none.

Terms, including every expense except bed and bedding, books and stationery, from $160 to $200 per annum, payable quarterly in advance.

The Summer term commences on Monday the 8d of May. Catalogues of the pupils and patrons may be had at the office of the Churchman, No. 111 Nassau street, or at the institute.

References.—The Right Rev. B. T. Onderdonk, and the Episcopal clergy of Brooklyn generally.

All letters addressed to JOHN YOUNG, Brooklyn, will meet with prompt attention. June 25.

TEACHER WANTED.

AN election for Principal of the All Saints' Academy, (in All Saints' Parish, Waccamaw, South Carolina,) will be made in December, the close of the present term, when the resignation of C. W. Crouch, Esq., agreeably to notice, will take effect. The Academy will re-open on Monday, January 8, 1844.

Salary $1200 per annum, in semi-annual payments. The boarders in the Institution pay the Principal $12 per month for board.

For further information, address the Trustees at Georgetown, South Carolina, or the Rev. Alexander Glennie, rector of All Saints' Parish, who has a superintendence of the School.

R. F. W. ALLSTON,
T. PINCKNEY ALSTON,
JOHN D. MAGILL,
July 15—tN1. Trustees.

☞ JOHN MORISON, Sexton in the Parish o Trinity Church, and Undertaker, having been appointed by the Corporation of Trinity Church, Superintendent of Funerals and Interments in the ground belonging to them, all applications for interments in their ground must be made to him from 9 A. M. to 3 P. M. at the Trinity Church Vestry Office, corner of Fulton and Church sts, and at other hours at his house, No. 17 Clarkson st, near Hudson st. He will find all articles requisite for funerals on reasonable terms, and give punctual attendance. Dec 11—yly

PARISH LIBRARY, 13 vols—viz:

VOL. 1, Leslie and West.
Vol. 2, Sumner on Preaching.
Vol. 3, Jewell's Apology.
4, Clement's Epistles.
5, Gibson's Letters.
6, Sherlock's Discourses.
7, Sumner on Matthew and Mark.
8, and 9, Works on Episcopacy.
10, Jebb's Kempis.
11, Walton's Lives.
12, Burnett's Lives.
13. Sumner on St. Luke. Fresh bound in cloth, $8.

J. A. SPARKS,
Churchman's Bookstore,
May 27. 109 Nassau-street.

PUBLISHED AND FOR SALE BY THE

GENERAL PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION,

DEPOSITORY, No. 20 JOHN STREET, NEW YORK.

BOOKS OF INSTRUCTION.

Union Primer, perhundred,	$3 00
Prot Epis S S Book, No. 1, per hundred,	1 38
" " " 2, "	1 75
" " " 3, "	2 00
" " " 4, "	5 00
Questions on the S S Books,	5 00
Catechism No. 1, (Scripture Catechism, per hun.	1 38
Catechism No. 2, (Catechism broken into short questions and answers,)	" 2 50
Catechism No. 3, (Catechism enlarged by Bishop Hobart,) stiff covers,	" 10 00
Catechism No. 4, (Catechism of the History of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,)	" 5 00
Lloyd's Catechism on the Evidences of the Bible,	" 3 00
Church Catechism,	" 1 25
First Truths,	" 2 50
Duty to God,	" 0 50
Church Primer,	" 1 38
Sunday School Liturgy and Psalms and Hymns, stiff covers,	" 10 00
Manual of Short Prayers for Children,	" 1 75
Harmony of the Creeds,	" 2 25
Questions on the Book of Common Prayer,	" 2 25
Collects from the Prayer Book,	" 2 00
Questions on the Collects, stiff covers,	" 10 00
Catechism on the Collects,	" 25 00
Epistles and Gospels from the Prayer Book,	" 8 00
Questions on the Epistles and Gospels, parts 1 and 2, stiff covers,	" 10 00
Bible Companion, Vol. 1, Old Testament,	" 20 00
" " Vol. 2, New do	" 22 00
Quest. on St. Matthew, part 1, stiff covers,	" 10 00
" " 2, "	" 9 00
" " 3, "	" 10 00
Questions on The Acts, 1, "	" 10 00
" " 2, "	" 9 00
" " 3. "	" 8 00
Easy Questions for a Little Child,	" 2 50

A discount of ten per cent. from the above prices is allowed to Sunday Schools auxiliary to the Union, and to individuals purchasing to the amount of ten dollars.

LIBRARY BOOKS.

The PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL SUNDAY SCHOOL LIBRARY 76 vols. 18mo.—nett price 20 cents each.

THE SAME, bound in 29 volumes of various prices.—Total, $18 93 nett.

The CHILDREN'S MAGAZINE, bound in 23 volumes o 144 pages each price for the set, $5 80 nett.

The JUVENILE LIBRARY, 6 vols. 32mo.—price for the set, 8¾ cents nett.

Address all orders for Books, and all remittances, to

DANIEL DANA, Jr., Agent,
Church Depository, 20 John st.
New York, March 18, 1843.

THE CHURCHMAN,

EDITED BY

THE REV. SAMUEL SEABURY, D. D.,

And under the General Direction and Supervision o

THE BISHOP OF THE DIOCESE OF NEW YORK,

of whom it is the Official Organ of Communication with his Diocese.

It is published every Saturday for the proprietors, by

JAMES A. SPARKS,

109 Nassau-street, New York, *up stairs.*

Its object is to disseminate religious intelligence elucidate Christian doctrine, and explain and enforce the principles and precepts of evangelical piety.

For the proper and more effectual accomplishment of these objects, it is, as it ever has been, since its establishment in 1831, devoted to the interests, in every department, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and to this end sets forth, elucidates, and when necessary defends, those principles and that policy, which have ever characterized the Diocese of New York, and by the divine blessing on which that Diocese has been enabled to maintain so much efficiency in promoting

"THE UNITED INTERESTS OF THE GOSPEL AND THE CHURCH."

Communications intended for insertion should be addressed to the *Editor*, and letters on business to the *Publisher*.

TERMS. *Three dollars* per annum, payable in advance. No subscription received for less than six months; and none discontinued until arrearages are paid, unless at the option of the proprietor.

AGENTS.

Rev. Charles Burroughs, D.D., George M. Marsh,	Portsmouth, N.H.
Charles Stimpson,	Boston, Mass.
Samuel R. Slack,	East Cambridge, "
Burnett & Blodget,	Providence, R. I.
David Le Favour,	Pawtucket, "
G. G Smith,	St. Albans, Vt.
Rev. Josiah Perry,	Brandon, "
Croswell & Jewett, Booksellers,	New Haven, "
Henry S. Parsons,	Hartford, "
W. C. Little, Esq.	Albany, N. Y.
Charles B Pinckney,	Catskill, "
Stephen P. Nash, Esq.	Saratoga Springs, "
A. A. Van Voorst,	Schenectady, "
Young & Hart,	Troy, "
Alexander Walsh, Esq (gratis)	Lansingburgh, "
Ebenezer C. Arnold,	Poughkeepsie, "
William Purdy,	Newburgh, "
Thomas C. Miller,	Auburn, "
Dr. A. F. Dodge,	Geneva, "
Isaiah Tiffany,	Utica, "
J. F. Hutchinson, Esq. P. M.	Watertown, "
A. B. Watson,	Unadilla, "
Henry Adriance,	Oswego, "
H. N. Walker,	Buffalo, "
W. R. & C. E. Peck,	do "
D. L. Farnam, Esq.	Fayetteville, "
R. S. H. George, Bookseller, 26 South Fifth street,	Philadelphia
George S. Appleton, Bookseller, 148 Chestnut-st,	Philadelphia,
H. J. Terry, Esq.	Newcastle, Del.
Knight & Colburn,	Baltimore, Md.
J. Biscoe, Post Office,	Chaptico, "
Wm. W. Johnston, Esq., P.M.	Princess Ann, "
Bell & Entwistle,	Alexandria, D. C.
George Rowland Esq.,	Norfolk, Va.
Joseph Gill,	Richmond, "
A. A. Brown, Esq.,	Wilmington, N. C.
A. E. Miller,	Charleston, S. C
G. McLaughlin,	Augusta, G.
Solomon K. Grant,	Louisville, Ky.
William Jacho,	Lexington, "
Arius Nye,	Marietta, Ohio
Lewis Handerson,	Cleveland. "
Henry H. Hoffman, Post Office,	Quincy, Ill.
P. E. Demill, Esq.	Jackson, Michigan
Rev. E. O. Hodgkin,	Homer, "
David H. Armstrong,	St. Louis, Mo.
Brevoort Butler,	Natchez, Miss